

BX

5965

.G2

TRUE
CHURCHMANSHIP
VINDICATED.

Class

Book

University of Chicago Library

GIVEN BY

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page

10. 10. 1911

11

TRUE

CHURCHMANSHIP VINDICATED;

OR,

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

NOT EXCLUSIVE.

BY REV. MASON GALLAGHER,
RECTOR OF TRINITY CHURCH, COVINGTON, KY.

CINCINNATI:
H. W. DERBY & CO., PUBLISHERS,
1851.

B X 5965

. G2

CINCINNATI:

Morgan & Overend, Printers.

301512

TO
MY MOTHER:
TO WHOSE EARLY RELIGIOUS CULTURE AND PRAYERS,
I FEEL THAT I OWE,
UNDER GOD,
MY HOPE FOR ETERNITY :
THIS DISCOURSE
IS
RESPECTFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY
INSCRIBED.

PREFACE.

THE following sermon is published at the request of valued and judicious friends, to whose opinion of its probable usefulness in the church, the writer feels bound to yield.

On his first entrance upon the ministry, taking it too much for granted that the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of England, held to the doctrine of the exclusive Divine right of Bishops, and that without this order there was no church, like many others, he honestly and zealously maintained this view; his reading, influenced by the bias of his mind, being generally on that side of the question.

But subsequent and fuller examination has shown him his error. He is now convinced by sufficient evidence, that this is not the view maintained by our standards and the fathers of the American Episcopal church. That it was not held by the English reformers, nor by the divines who succeeded them in the reign of Elizabeth, nor by the great body of eminent divines of that church since their time. That the exclusive view was introduced into the English church

in the reign of James I, by Archbishop Laud who borrowed it from the Presbyterian church of Geneva, and from the English Puritans. That but few names of any authority are found to support it, that the laity of England have not generally received it, and that the history of the doctrine shows that it has brought great evil on the English and American Episcopal churches.

The proofs of these positions are presented in the following pages. It will be seen from the nature of these positions that the writer does not propose to discuss the question, what is the most scriptural and primitive form of church government. His remarks are addressed to those who have already decided in favor of Episcopacy, as a point of difference between us and our brethren of other churches. He discusses the subject, therefore, not as a scriptural, but rather as a *constitutional* question—just as a public functionary of this country would ascertain the meaning of our political constitution, irrespective of the primary and original question, whether Monarchy, Democracy or Republicanism be the best form of government. In short, his object is to show who are consistent Episcopalians.

That the Divine blessing may accompany the work is the writer's sincere prayer.

TRUE

CHURCHMANSHIP VINDICATED.

AND there ran a young man and told Moses, and said Eldad and Medad do prophesy in the camp. And Joshua, the son of Nun, the servant of Moses, one of his young men, answered and said, My lord Moses, forbid them. And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!—NUM., xi: 27-9.

And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us.—ST LUKE, ix: 49, 50.

What then? notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.—PHIL., i: 18.

THE words I have read, convey a plain intimation to God's people of the feelings they should entertain toward those who, worshipping the same God, and trusting for salvation in the same Saviour, belong to another denomination. The words of St. Paul, of Moses, and of Christ, rebuke a spirit of exclusiveness, of partizanship, of bigotry in matters of religion.

Joshua and John, pious young men, beloved by their masters, in a fit of youthful but ill-judged zeal, tinctured with the exclusive spirit so prevalent with their people, would have prevented the irregular ministrations of some who, not of the sacred school of the prophets, presumed to prophesy.

They are rebuked in language uttered no

doubt, as a lesson to be pondered by *us*, and by all who should come after them—conveying this sentiment: That instead of *forbidding*, we should rejoice to behold fellow laborers in the contest for God and Christ: in breaking down the strong holds of Satan, and extending the kingdom of heaven.

Divided as the followers of Christ are now, into denominations,—separated in external communion—though holding the same faith, serving the same master, and looking for the same heavenly reward, how needful that we be governed by the principle enjoined in our texts, that we fall not out by the way. It is pleasant to behold the manifestation of late in many minds of different communions, of a desire to a more perfect union.

May this desire be granted, and if a perfect outward unity be not attained, may all who are truly one in Christ Jesus, discarding prejudice and envy, love one another with a pure heart, fervently.

May this spirit extend to every heart in our own Apostolic church; and may it be the aim of all, not rebuking or forbidding those who follow not with us, gladly to unite our efforts in the great contest waged with a common foe to God and man, Satan—the destroyer of our race.

My object, on the present occasion, is to show that the spirit manifested by Joshua and John, on the occasions mentioned, is not the spirit inculcated by our church; that our standards are free from an exclusive or uncharitable spirit; that our church no where claims that

she is the sole dispenser of the word, and sacraments of the gospel; that within her pale is alone to be found a valid commission to teach, and to administer the seals of the Christian covenant.

I expect to show—

I. That these were not the views of the Fathers of the American Episcopal church.

II. That they were not the views of the Reformers of the Church of England, nor of the great body of her leading divines since their time.

The parts of the Prayer Book bearing on this subject, are the Preface, the 19th and 23d articles, with the preface to the ordinal.

The liturgy breathes throughout a catholic spirit. The last prayer in the book, the prayer after communion, and the collect for All Saints Day, are among the instances. And particularly in the prayer for all conditions of men—where we pray for the Holy Church Universal; that all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be so guided and governed by the Holy Spirit, that they may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bonds of peace, and in righteousness of life. “Here we pray,” says Bishop Brownell, in his commentary, “not so much for the external prosperity of any portion of it, but for the whole church; the Oriental, the Greek, the Latin, the Reformed, with every denomination of Christians.”

In the preface to the prayer book as framed by our revisers we thus read: "When, in the course of Divine Providence, these American States became independent with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included; and the different religious denominations of Christians in these States were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize their *respective churches*, and forms of worship and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity, consistently with the constitution and laws of their country."

We here observe that the title of *Christian Churches*, is given to the different religious denominations in this country, with liberty to model their forms of worship and discipline as they saw fit.

They are styled *Churches*—not mere denominations of Christians. There are some who hold as you know, that Episcopacy is essential not only to the perfection, but to the very being of a church; that ordination, unless conveyed by a Bishop, is invalid—who will not give the title of church to any society which is not governed by Bishops.

Such were not the views of the founders of the American church, of the framers of the preface to our prayer book. It is maintained, however, that the framers of the preface, did not mean to recognize the church character of non-Episcopal societies by this term. This charge I think derogatory to their reputation, amounting to an accusation of insincerity.

I am glad to find by an examination of their

writings, that they meant what they said ; that they held Christian societies without the Episcopacy to be true and valid, though imperfect and irregular branches of the church of Christ. How are we to settle the meaning of the term "respective churches?"

Bishop Whittingham has furnished in his charge, 1849, p. 30, the proper rule to be observed in this inquiry—"The sense of the compiler, or composer; the original historical sense, that which was in the mind of those who first made and used the formularies, and which they meant they always should have,"—"what Cranmer and Ridley meant when they offered our forms of prayer, is the sense of those forms still where they remain unaltered."

We must, then, to find the meaning of the term "respective churches," inquire what its framers intended by the expression. To do this, we must consult their writings in the same manner as we would examine the views of Adams, Hamilton, Madison, Jefferson, Jay, and Washington in interpreting the American Constitution.

Who were the revisers of our Prayer book? By consulting Bishop White's *Memoirs of the American Church*, Bioren's *Journals of the General Convention*, we find that Bishop White, Dr. Wm. Smith, and Dr. Charles H. Wharton, were appointed in General Convention, 1785, a committee to "publish the Book of Common Prayer, with the alterations, as well as those now ratified, to render the liturgy consistent with the American revolution and the constitutions of the respective States, as the altera-

tions and new offices recommended to this church; and that the committee have the liberty to make verbal and grammatical corrections, but in such manner, as that nothing in form or substance be altered.”—*Bioren*, p. 15.

In the General Convention, 1789, the liturgy was again revised, and adopted generally as it now stands—a few additions being afterward made. In the matter of revising the liturgy, the above named clergymen took the leading part. The preface of the first revised book was written by Dr. Smith, (Wilson’s Memoir, p. 138.) The preface for the book as adopted in 1789, the writer has been informed was written by Bishop White. If we obtain the opinions of the divines above mentioned—the most prominent and influential in the primal deliberations of our church—I think we may arrive at the meaning of this term “respective churches,” together with the view then taken of the ordinal and articles on this point.

Bishop White styles Dr. Smith “the most prominent clergyman of his church.” He was successively Principal of Washington College, Maryland, and Provost of the College of Philadelphia. He presided in the House of Deputies from 1789 to 1799. The opinion of the church concerning Dr. Smith, may be seen from a resolution passed unanimously in General Convention, 1789, in regard to a volume of sermons proposed to be published by him:

“*Resolved*, unanimously, That the members of this Convention being fully persuaded that the interests of religion and practical godliness may be greatly promoted by the publication of

a body of sermons upon the plan proposed; and being well satisfied of the author's soundness in the faith, and eminent abilities for such a work, they do therefore testify their approbation of the same and their desire to encourage it by annexing their names as subscribers. —*Bioren*, p. 57.

I quote a few extracts from this author's sermons, vol. 2. p. 332. He recommends "A generous spirit of forbearance, toleration and charity to our Protestant brethren of other denominations. These are duties peculiarly incumbent on the ministers of so benevolent a religion as that of Jesus, and so generous a "church as that of England." (Preached 1760.) p. 496-8. "How long, alas! how long shall the divided sentiments of Christians be a reproach to their name? How long shall circumstantials prevail over essentials, embittering the followers of the lowly Jesus, and inflaming their breasts with a madness even unto death. A sense of this made the mild Melancthon, when he came to die, thank God, that he was going to be removed from temptation to sin, and the fierce rage of religious zealots. Surely, my brethren, I will repeat it again. There is greater weight and moment of Christianity in charity, than in all the doubtful questions about which the Protestant churches have been puzzling themselves, and biting and devouring each other since the days of the reformation." p. 63. Looking far beyond the bitter distinctions of sect or party (by which too many seek to know or to be known by, among each other) we should labor to imi-

tate the great Creator, in regarding those of every nation, religion and tongue who "fear Him and work righteousness." Such conduct becomes those who profess to believe that when our master, Christ, shall come again to reward his faithful workmen and servants, he will not ask whether we were of Luther or of Calvin? Whether we prayed to him in white, black or grey; in purple or in rags; in fine linen or in sackcloth; in a woollen frock, or peradventure in a leather apron? Whatever is considered as most convenient, most in character, most for edification, and infringes least on spiritual liberty, will be admitted as good in this case;" p. 540, (before first General Convention of our church, 1785.) "Our church, in the preface to her Common Prayer, allows the expediency and necessity of such changes from time to time. Even our language itself is fluctuating and receiving frequent improvements; and in what concerns religion and its various forms, rites and ceremonies, no church on earth can claim perfection. This belongs only to the church of the first born in heaven. * * * Let this, then, my brethren of the clergy and laity, namely, our works and living example, be the mutual test of our faith and your faith. For it will not be so much a question at the last day, of what church we were, not whether we were of Paul or Apollos, but whether we were of Christ Jesus, and had the true mark of Christianity in our lives."

Dr. Smith signed a call (1783) of clergy to consider "What alterations might be necessary

in our liturgy and service ; and how our church might be organized and a succession of ministry kept up, so as to be an object of public notice and support in common with other Christian churches under the revolution ;” and in company with the clergy of Maryland, a declaration of rights, containing this language, “ We consider it as the undoubted right of the Protestant Episcopal church, in common with other Christian churches under the American Revolution, to complete and preserve herself as an entire church, agreeably to her ancient usages and profession, and to have the full enjoyment and free exercise of those purely spiritual powers, which are essential to the being of every church or congregation of the faithful. That without calling in question the rights, modes and forms of any other Christian churches or societies, or wishing the least contest with them on that subject, we consider and declare it to be an essential right of the said Protestant Episcopal church to have and enjoy the continuance of the said three orders of ministers forever, so far as concerns matters purely spiritual.” pp. 515-20.

Rev. Charles H. Wharton, D. D., a converted Roman priest, died Rector of St. Mary’s, Burlington, N. J., 1833, aged 85. He was President of Columbia College, N. Y., 1801. Bishop Doane says of him in his funeral sermon, “ I knew him as among the very first in scholarship of the clergy of America, a sound and thoroughly accomplished divine, a practiced and successful controversialist, a faithful parish priest, the patriarch of the diocese in

which he lived." He alludes "to his profound and various learning;" and again, "with a most decided genius for mathematics, a perfect mastery of classical literature, and no ordinary measure of poetical ability, he is known only as a divine. In this his proper department of study, he was a master. When the General Theological Seminary was established, he was nominated as one of its first Professors (Systematic Theology.) In all the important measures relative to the organization of the church in this country, and especially in the revision of the liturgy, his learning, wisdom, and moderation, as Bishop White assures me, was most effective and valuable. The councils of the church, General and Diocesan, were always aided by his presence and participation." pp. 60, 70.

From Bishop Doane's edition of his works I take the following quotations, vol. 2, p. 32, "If you ask me, therefore, to what church I now belong, my answer is, to the *Christian Catholic Church*. Of that society of Christians I profess myself a member, who adopt the Holy Scriptures for the *sole* standard of their belief: the Protestant churches in general know no other rule: some shades of difference may subsist in their public liturgies and speculative disquisitions; but among none of the *principal* branches of the reformed churches are the latter obtruded as *articles of faith*, or the former found repugnant to reason or morality. Through the same Divine Mediator they worship the same God; and from the sufferings and merits of the same Redeemer

they expect forgiveness of their sins, and happiness for evermore. In this country, where the *Christian* only is the established religion, where tests and subscriptions are unknown; where refined speculations are not likely to deform the simplicity or interrupt the harmony of the gospel, I look forward with rapture to that auspicious day, when Protestants, opening their eyes upon their mutual agreement in all the *essentials* of belief, will forget past animosities and cease to regard each other as of different communions." The italics are the author's own. p. 361. "The fact then is that the Protestant churches, being lively branches of the Catholic church, have the promise of Christ to secure them from destructive errors. This promise they find in their bibles; on Him who made it, they rely for its performance; and His unerring guidance they endeavor cordially to adopt and follow, as well as every other doctrine and precept which they read in His revealed word. As to the divisions among Protestants, which the Doctor attributes to their making the scriptures their sole rule of faith, they were such as did not aim at subverting the foundations of Christianity, or, if they did so, the communities thus guilty, no longer deserved the name of Christian churches."

"To this Christian Catholic church the chaplain trusts he belongs. Happily for him, no society of Christians can annul his right to this sacred communion; among the various churches, in which Christians are divided, he may join that which best suits his ideas of self-

government, and which appears to him to be the furthest removed from philosophical indifference on the one hand, and fanaticism on the other; but, in the great and essential points of faith, he shall ever consider himself a member of all whose religion is that of the Bible *only*." p. 209.

In an ordination sermon, speaking of the congregation addressed, vol. 1, page 130, Dr. Wharton says—"Their past and present exertions, so liberal, so uncommon, are a sure pledge of their future zeal in the cause of the sanctuary. While discarding from their minds every feeling of bigotry, and cherishing for sister churches sincere esteem and affection, they still felt the want of their own peculiar institutions—of the forms by which their forefathers had worshipped the Eternal." Dr. Wharton's writings furnish an arsenal, from which, valuable weapons may be drawn in the battle waging with Romanism.

Concerning Bishop White's position in our church, nothing need be said. His praise is in all the churches. His patient energy, his wise moderation, his profound learning, his humble piety, are known to all. The title of "Father of the American church," has universally been bestowed upon him. Dr. Wilson says of him, p. 229—"Dr. White formed his theological views, after full examination, and on clear conviction, upon the model of those of the low church divines—as they are called in England—of the established church in that country." P. 87, Bishop White says—"In regard to Episcopacy, I think that it should be sus-

tained, as the government of the church from the time of the Apostles, but without criminalizing the ministry of other churches; as is the course taken by the church of England." On the Catechism, p. 157, he says of the English Reformers—"We may freely confess, (it agreeing with their conduct in a variety of ways,) that in laying down articles of faith, they had no design of condemning other Protestant churches on points of discipline." P. 174—"I am engaged in opening and defending the sense of the Episcopal church, as received from the Church of England. At the same time that, in point of fact, she decidedly set her feet on the ground of the Apostolic origin of Episcopacy, she carefully avoided passing a judgment on the validity of the ministry of other churches."

Pages 424-5-6. "Another question may be raised—Whether the institution of Episcopacy be obligatory on Christians in all times and places; so that on this is dependent the being of a Christian church. Certain it is, that the Church of England did not, in any of her institutions, say anything decisive on the question now contemplated. Not only so, many of her public proceedings show her care to avoid it; of which only the following instance shall be given. When the Episcopacy was conveyed by that church to the church of Scotland, in the reign of James the First, it was pressed by some, that the ministers sent for consecration should previously be ordained deacons and priests; their ministerial character being in virtue of ordination not Episcopal. But Arch-

bishop Bancroft—the very prelate accused by the Puritans of that day of carrying the Episcopal claims higher than had been done by his predecessors—overruled the objection, ‘lest the calling and character of the ministry, in most of the Reformed churches, might be questioned’.”

In a subsequent paragraph, he says—“To some it may seem inconsistent with the moderation here affirmed, that in the church of England and in this church, no minister ordained in another communion, not Episcopal, and conforming to the institutions of either of the said churches, can be admitted to its ministry without Episcopal ordination. But there is no inconsistency in the maxims. These churches do not judge of the sufficiency of peculiar circumstances, in regard to others. But they perceive no such circumstances, in the relations in which they stand. Therefore, for them to dispense, within their respective bounds, with the difference of grade in the ministerial character, when they think that they discover clear evidence of it in the appointments of the Apostles, would be conduct, which they could not defend on any principle of consistency.”

In his work, “Case of the Episcopal Church Considered,” Bishop White declares, “The opinion that Episcopacy was the most ancient and eligible, but without any idea of Divine right in the case, this the author believes to be the sentiment of the great body of Episcopalians in America, in which respect they have in their favor, unquestionably, the sense of the

Church of England, and as he believes, the opinions of her most distinguished prelates for piety, virtue and abilities.”

Again, in a Charge on Past and Future, 1834, p. 15, he says—“ With deep solicitude for the sustaining the integrity of our church in this matter, there is not perceived the necessity of carrying it to the extreme of denouncing all communions destitute of the Episcopacy, as departing from the essentials of the Christian faith, and as aliens from the Covenants of Promise. * * * * *

“ The deliverer of this present charge, in the exercise of the like freedom of opinion, is rather disposed to adopt the sentiments of an able and learned Archbishop of Canterbury, (Dr. Wake,) where he says, in a letter to an eminent foreign divine — ‘ far be it from me such an obdurate heart, as that because of this defect, (the want of Episcopacy,) I should say of some churches that they are to be cut off from our communion, or should pronounce, with over-ardent writers among us, that they have no valid sacraments, and are scarcely Christian.’ Many English prelates might be cited to the same effect.”

Thus were the fathers of our church noble witnesses to her Catholic and Christian spirit.

It may be objected, however, that these are but the private opinions of individual members of our church—that these comprehensive, liberal views were not entertained by all.

The case of Bishop Seabury, who, it is well known, differed on these points with his colleagues, is presented, by our opponents.

With all due respect, it is replied, that he was in the *minority*, and therefore not to be regarded as representing the sentiments of our church. He belonged to a different school of theology from the church generally, in America, as Bishop White testifies. His opinions, on most controverted points, were not the opinions of the General Convention. It is true, that in some non-essential matters his wishes were regarded, but in others more important they were not.

Bishop Seabury was opposed to the admission of laymen into ecclesiastical conventions, to the alternative form in the ordination service for presbyters. He desired the retention of the Athanasian creed. But the church ruled otherwise. And in regard to a point where his wishes prevailed—the restoration of the oblation in the consecration prayer in the communion service—Bishop White writes, Mem. p. 187. “That there was no considerable opposition to this change. It lay very near to the heart of Bishop Seabury. For himself, without conceiving, with some, that the service, as it stood, was essentially defective, he always thought there was a beauty in those ancient forms, and can discover no superstition in them. If indeed they could have been reasonably thought to imply, that a Christian minister is a priest, in the sense of an offerer of sacrifice, and that the table is an altar, and the elements a sacrifice, in any other than figurative senses, he would have zealously opposed the admission of such unevangelical sentiments—as he conceives them to be.”

And we have no reason to believe that any measure which Bishop White zealously opposed could have succeeded. The fact that the great majority of the convention was of moderate liberal sentiments, appears to settle the question in regard to the meaning of the term, "respective churches," and the matters bearing on these points. The sentiments of the divines I have presented, are therefore the sentiments of our church.

This liberal view of our church concerning our fellow Christians, is also seen in the Pastoral Letters of the house of Bishops. These may be regarded as authoritative declarations of her sentiments. In the letter of 1838, it is declared—"The spirit of meekness, and of benevolence, and of liberality, truly so called, is remarkably manifest in the deliberations of our church; and happy will it be if all its members imbibe this spirit, equally free from enthusiasm, bigotry, and superstition.

"It is not necessary to true charity, (though much to be desired,) that Christians should be, in everything, of one mind; nor that all should be of the same denomination. We may live as brethren, though as such we do not commune together in all the ordinances of Christ. But to be truly his disciples, it is necessary we should love those who love him, and because they love him. It is a profitable and a pleasing exercise of charity to view with compassion the errors and mistakes of pious, well-meaning people, and to love those who love the same Saviour and worship the same God. When we consider that numbers among

us scoff at all religion, and how many professing to be Christians, reject what we deem to be essential doctrines of Christ, 'making his cross of none effect,' and how many others have disfigured the truth and simplicity of the gospel by the inventions of man, they who happily agree in what is essential should delight in cultivating love and living as brethren, not permitting strifes of words and questions of expediency to disunite them." These are the pious words of the Apostolic Griswold.

In the Pastoral Letter written by Bishop White, of 1828: "It is no small addition to the satisfaction 'of being at peace among ourselves,' that we are on terms of good neighborhood and Christian sympathy with our fellow Christians of other denominations. The wisest and the most Christian course that can be pursued by us, is to conduct the concerns of our church agreeably to its matured and long existing institutions, and under the sense of responsibility to its Divine head; but without reference to others, professing to worship the same God, through the merits of the same Redeemer, except to put the most favorable constructions on their acts, to rejoice in any good resulting from them, and scrupulously to avoid whatever may have a tendency to excite angry passions, either in them or in ourselves."

Letter of 1817. "In reference to those who do not unite with us in our views of scriptural doctrine and worship, we exhort all the members of our church to that moderation in the manner of sustaining the truths, that forbear-

ance in the manner of opposing error, and that esteem for merit wheresoever found—the contrary to which has been in too many instances a reproach to the Christian name. We do not wish to see the institutions of our church, a cover of that ‘wrath of man which worketh not the righteousness of God.’ Of many opinions conflicting with ours, we believe that the origin of the diversity is in the different senses annexed to the words. In many other cases, we trace it to hereditary prejudice, descending from former times, without the hostility by which it had been generated.” See, also, Letter of 1832.

What follower of Christ, baptized with his spirit, would refuse his assent to sentiments like these? they breathe the spirit of the Bible; they manifest the mind of the Apostle Paul, of Moses, of our blessed Saviour. Such is the true spirit of our beloved church, and were her children all to feel its influence, “Ephraim would no longer envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim.”

We have thus far proceeded in our argument, and have shown, as evidence of the catholic comprehensive character of our church, that in styling the religious denominations around us Christian churches, she has openly and plainly declared them to be true and living members of the body of Christ.

To remove all objections, we have quoted largely from the published writings of the framers of the preface, who clearly teach these views in regard to other Christian churches—which sentiments Bishop White, (who had

every means of knowing, and was careful to an extreme in expressing his opinions,) regarded as that "of the great body of Episcopalians in America." P. 20.

We rejoice to be able to present this testimony—we rejoice that to men of such moderation, wisdom, and energy, was committed the important duty of organizing and establishing so noble a branch of the catholic and apostolic church of Christ.

Here we might close the argument; for the character of the preface determines that of the rest of the Prayer-book. Its framers have there given the deliberate opinion of our church upon this interesting topic. But, as other portions of the Book of Common Prayer, compiled in England, are appealed to in support of the views we are opposing, we propose to show—

II. That they were not the views of the Reformers of the Church of England, nor of the great body of her leading divines since their time.

That the views of our Church, except in that which pertains to the civil establishment, are the same as those of the Church of England, we suppose will not be denied.

Says the Pastoral Letter of 1817, page 72—
 "We wish it to be understood, that while, agreeably to the known principles as well of the Church of England as of the Episcopal church in these states, we deny all subjection of the one to the other; we contemplate a unity of principle, in whatever belongs to

doctrine, or to worship, or to the Christian Ministry, considered independently of any connection with the state, or other local circumstance. In all this, we are so far from denying identity of character, that the hope of perpetuating it enters into all our cares and labors."

In Charge on Past and Future, 1834, p. 12, Bishop White writes—"We have applied to our venerable mother for the completion of our ministry; and the favor has been granted, in full faith of our continuance in the doctrines professed by her through many ages.

"For these reasons, it will always be a duty binding on us, to 'look to the rock from which we were hewn;' and in obeying the Scripture admonition of 'asking for the old paths,' to trace them in the institutions and in the history of the Church from which we are descended."

Our first position, then, is—that the articles do not deny the validity of non-episcopal orders.

The articles connected with this subject, as before mentioned, are the 19th and 23rd.

The portion of the 19th, bearing on this point, reads thus:—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinances, in all those things which are of necessity requisite to the same."

The 23rd is as follows:—"It is not lawful for any man to take on him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which

be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

Here we observe nothing said of the necessity of Episcopal ordination. Indeed, these articles might be signed by any orthodox Protestant. The exclusive notion derives no support from this portion of our standards.

Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of the Twenty-third article, says—"They who drew it up had the state of the several churches before their eyes that had been differently reformed; and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten track than any other, yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times; necessity has no law, and is a law unto itself." And further—"Whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned these articles, but the body of this church for half an age after, did, notwithstanding these irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches so constituted, to be *true churches, as to all the essentials of a church*, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the article is framed, seems to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them."

Bishop Tomline, on the 19th article, remarks, page 329—"In this article, the 'visible

church' is used in a more limited sense, and comprehends only the Christians of one country or city, or of one persuasion; thus it mentions the Church of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Rome; and in like manner we often speak of the Church of England, of Holland, of Geneva, and of the Lutheran church; and all these different churches are parts of the visible Catholic church."

In further proof that the articles were not intended to invalidate Presbyterian ordination, we will show—

1. *That the validity of these orders was recognized by public acts.*

2. *That numbers who had not received episcopal ordination were allowed to hold livings, to preach, and to administer the sacraments for upwards of one hundred years after the reformation.*

1. *That the validity of these orders was recognized by public acts.*

In the 13th year of Elizabeth, 1571, an act was passed in these words—"Every person under the degree of Bishop which doth or shall pretend to be a Priest or Minister of God's holy word and sacraments by reason of any other form of institution, or consecration, than the form set forth by Parliament, . . . shall, in the presence of a bishop or guardian of the spiritualities of some one of the dioceses, where he hath or shall have ecclesiastical living, declare his assent, and subscribe to all the articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments comprised in this book."

On this act Strype remarks, vol. ii, p. 514—

“By this the ordinations of the foreign reformed churches were made valid, and those that had no other orders were made of the same capacity with others to enjoy any place in the ministry, within England, merely on their subscribing the articles.”

Keble admits, (preface to Hooker, page 76,) that—“Nearly up to the time Hooker wrote, (1594,) numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than Presbyterian ordination; and it appears by Travers’ supplication to the Council, that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England.”

Again, the 55th canon of the Church of England, passed 1603, enjoins on ministers, to move the people to join with them, before sermon, in making the following prayer:—“For Christ’s holy catholic church—that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland.” Here the Presbyterian church of Scotland is plainly acknowledged to be a sister church.

Again, the Church of England was represented in the Synod of Dort, 1618, by five eminent divines. In this Presbyterian body an English Bishop sat as a private member, the President being a Presbyterian minister. Bishop Hall, who was obliged to leave on ac-

count of ill health, in his farewell sermon, declares that "there was no place on earth like the Synod of Dort, and where he should more like to dwell." Brandt, Sess. 62.

In their proceedings in this body, the English delegates evidently seemed to regard their fellow members as brother clergymen.

Having thus seen that the Church of England publicly recognized the validity of non-episcopal orders, we proceed to show—

2. *That numbers who had not received episcopal ordination were allowed to hold livings, to preach, and to administer the sacraments within her pale, for upwards of one hundred years after the reformation.*

Bishop Cosin, in his letter to Cordel, Hooker's ed., 1844, says, "If at any time a minister so ordained in these French churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us, in the Church of England, (as I have known some of them to have done of late, and can instance in many others before my time,) our Bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge; as they must have done, if his former ordination in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and to subscribe the Articles established."

Bishop Burnet writes, in his *Vindication*, p. 84—"No Bishop in Scotland, during my stay in that kingdom, did so much as desire any of the Presbyterians to be re-ordained."

A few instances on record of this nature will be given.

Strype, in his annals, mentions that in 1569, Cavellerius, a French protestant minister, was instituted into a prebendal state at Canterbury ; that Corranus, a Spanish pastor, was preferred to a rectorship in divinity at the temple, and was subsequently a prebendary at St. Pauls.

In 1582, John Morrison, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was licensed to preach in England, by Archbishop Grindall. His license thus reads: "Whereas, we have heard on credible testimony, that you, the aforesaid John Morrison, about five years since, in the town of Garvet, Lothian, Scotland, was admitted and ordained to Holy Orders and the sacred ministry, by the imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the Church of Scotland. We, therefore, approving and ratifying as far as in us lies, and by right we may, the form of your ordination and advancement to this sacred function, done in the manner aforesaid, grant and impart to you in the Lord with all good will, license and faculty in these orders by you taken, to celebrate divine offices, to administer the sacrament, and sincerely to preach the word of God." *Hone's Grind'l*, 151.

Strype, Annals, vol. ii, 523, gives an account of William Whittingham, who was ordained in Geneva, and was Dean of Durham under Bishop Pilkington, one of the compilers of the prayer book. After Pilkington's death, Whittingham's orders being called in question, a commission was appointed, when Whittingham

having produced his Geneva certificate, the lord president dismissed the council, saying that "he could not in conscience consent to deprive him for that cause only."

Bishop Cosin gives the case of Dr. Delaune, the translator of the prayer book into French, who was ordained by the presbytery at Leyden, and who was admitted to a living in England, by Bishop Overall, without re-ordination. See Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, p. 125.

We have already seen, in a quotation given by Bishop White, that the validity of the Scotch Presbyterian orders, was admitted by Bancroft and other bishops, in 1603. See page 19.

Bishop Hall, in his "Humble Remonstrance," vol. x. 341, says: "The sticking at the admission of our brethren returning from foreign reformed churches, was not in the case of ordination, but institution; they had been acknowledged ministers of Christ without any other hands laid upon them, but according to the laws of our land, they were not capable of institution to a benefice, unless they were so qualified as the statutes of this realm doth require. And, secondly—I know those, more than one, that by virtue of that ordination, which they have brought with them from other reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings, without any exceptions against the lawfulness of their calling."

Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, pp. 226 and 424, and Macaulay, *Hist. Eng.*, vol. i, pp. 57 and 132, Harp. eds., testify to the same purpose.

Neither state nor church, in any public act, has ever countenanced the view that episco-

pacy is essential to the being of a church: but, on the contrary, have plainly recognized non-episcopal churches as true churches, though imperfect, and their ordination as valid, though not strictly regular.

Again, if we apply Bishop Whittingham's rule of interpretation to the articles, it will settle this matter beyond all doubt.

This rule, as we have seen, is "the sense of compiler or composer: the original historical sense, that which was in the minds of those who first made and used the formularies, and which they meant they should always have."

Now our present articles were framed in 1562 and 1571, in the reign of Elizabeth, under the primacy of Archbishop Parker.

No age has produced a body of church writers more eminent for learning, wisdom, and piety, than that of Elizabeth. But while they ably and successfully defend their church against the attacks of Romanists and Puritans, and sustain her primitive polity, not one is to be found—certainly none of reputation—who maintains the exclusive divine right of episcopacy; or who regards that order as necessary to the being of a church.

They consider episcopacy either as instituted by the church, after the death of the apostles, or as established during their lifetime; and not immutable in such a sense as to invalidate Presbyterian orders.

As the articles were framed by these divines, it is, therefore, *incredible* that they could have been designed to be exclusive in their character.

Our limits will allow us to give but brief extracts from the leading writers of this reign.

Archbishop Parker recognized the validity of non-Episcopal orders. This is evident from his admission of Cavellerius and Corranus to livings in England. See page 32.

Archbishop Grindall's license to Morrison proves his view to have been the same. His biographer remarks, "Grindall was not singular in regarding the foreign Protestant churches as sister churches to that of England, though their constitution was on the Presbyterian platform." Hone's Grindall, 150.

John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, "the worthiest divine, which Christendom has produced for some hundred years," says Hooker, "whose Apology and Defense was placed in all the parish churches;" "which," Dr. Randolph states, "has had the sanction of public authority, and may, therefore, be relied on as containing the final and decided opinion of our reformers, approved in the general by the church at large;"—who compiled a portion of our homilies, and was appointed to superintend the printing of our articles;—of whom Bishop Whittingham writes, in his memoirs prefixed to his edition of "The Apology:"—"With one mouth, his contemporaries and successors, conspire to represent him as the great champion of the Reformation in its last struggle for predominance; his eloquence, and industry, and zeal, as the chief cause, under God, of the happy termination of that struggle. . . It is faint praise to say of him, that the scholar, the Christian, and above all,

the gospel minister, may look to him with pride and thankfulness, as their model."

He says, Apology, ch. vi, s. 6, "The catholic church is the kingdom, the body, and the spouse of Christ: that Christ is the only Prince of this kingdom; that there are in the church divers orders of ministers; that there are some who are deacons, others who are presbyters, and others who are bishops—to whom the instruction of the people, and the care and management of religion are committed."

But while thus holding to the three orders, did Jewel sustain the exclusive, divine right of Bishops?—far from it.

In Apology, ch. xiii, sec. 10, p. 244, Bishop Whittingham's ed., he writes, "God's grace is promised to a good mind, and to any one that feareth him; not to sees and succession."

He says, in Defense of Apology, part second, p. 335, Parker society edition: "We have neither bishops without church, nor church without bishops; neither doth the Church of England this day depend upon them, whom you often call apostates, *as if our church were no church without them.* . . . If there were not one, neither of them, nor of us, left alive, yet would not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Louvaine." To Harding's remark in favor of tradition, "they which denied the distinction of a bishop and a priest were condemned of heresy"—Jewel replies, page 439: "What meant Mr. Harding here to come in with the distinction of bishops and priests? Thinketh he that priests and bishops hold only by tradition! or is it so horrible a heresy as he

maketh it to say that by the scriptures of God a bishop and a priest are all one. Or knoweth he how far, and to whom he reacheth the name of heretic?" Then quoting Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose, in support of this view, he adds, "All these, and other more holy fathers, together with St. Paul, the Apostle, for thus saying, by Mr. Harding's advice, must be holden for heretics."

On p. 294, he quotes Augustine: "Augustine saith the office of a bishop is above the office of a priest (*not by the authority of scripture*) but after the names of honor which the custom of the church hath now obtained." The words italicised are Jewel's, and shew that he regarded the bishop as first priest, and above a presbyter, by the names of honor which the custom of the church hath obtained, rather than by the authority of scripture.

Archbishop Whitgift, "the worthiest man," says Fuller, "that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy;" while he writes to Beza—Strype's Whitgift, 2, 170: "We make no doubt that the Episcopal degree (which we bear) is an institution Apostolical and Divine, and so has been always held by a continued course of times, from the Apostles' times to this very age of ours." He says, in his answer to Cartwright, "The controversy is not whether many things mentioned were fitly used in the Apostles' times, or may now be used—yea, or conveniently used in the reformed churches; that none of these branches were denied, neither did they take on them either to blame (as slandered) or condemn foreign churches, for such

orders as they had received as most fit for their estates," vol. i, p. 112.

Dr. Cosin's, Whitgift's Chancellor, writes — "All churches have not the same form of government, neither is it necessary that they should, seeing it can not be proved that any certain particular form of church government is commended to us in the word of God." Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, p. 416.

Says Bishop Bridges, *Defense*, p. 87: "God hath not expressed the form of church government, at least not so as to bind us to it."

Dr. Hadrian Saravia has been charged with maintaining the exclusive divine right of bishops, but Whitgift in his letter to Beza, (see page 90,) defends him from this charge. Whitgift writes, "Dr. Saravia's purpose in asserting degrees among the ministers of the gospel, was wholly undertaken without the prejudice and injury of any particular church." And Saravia writes, (see *Strype's Whitgift*, p. 204,) "They do ill whoever separate and divide from one another, because of external rites and ceremonies. It is a certain sign of a very weak judgment, or else a Pharisaical pride of conceit, to refuse the communion of the church (in which Christ, and grace obtained by Christ, is plainly taught,) only for difference of external rites."

Dr. Sutcliff, dean of Exeter, styled "a very learned writer in defense of the establishment," who wrote the first book against Presbytery in English, has also been charged with holding the exclusive view. But Whitgift denies that this charge is just, and Sutcliff,

himself, in his Treatise on the Church, writes, "That is an orthodox and truly catholic church, which, though dispersed throughout England, Germany, France, and other countries, is united by a harmonious confession of the Christian faith."

Thomas Cooper, bishop of Winchester, in his Admonition, p. 66, writes: "All those churches in which the gospel in these days, after great darkness, was first revived, and the learned men whom God sent to instruct them, I doubt not but have been directed by the Spirit of God to retain their liberty, that in external government, and other inherent orders, they might choose such as they thought, in wisdom and godliness, to be most convenient for the state of their country and the disposition of their people."

Dr. Low, in his "Complaint of the Church," p. 64, writes: "No certain form of government is prescribed in the Word, only general rules laid down for it."

Dr. John Reynolds, Divinity Professor at Oxford, "who was nearly, if not altogether, the most learned man in England," says Hallam, "whose memory and reading were near a miracle," writes Bishop Hall; who died while engaged in our translation of the Bible; was asked by Sir Francis Knollys, an eminent layman, "If bishops were superior governors over their brethren, by God's ordinance, i. e. *jure divino*?" Dr. Reynolds replied, "It is quite a different thing to say that, *by the word of God* there is a difference between them, and to say that it is *by the order and custom of the*

church," which is all that St. Austin maintains. When Harding, the papist, alleged these very witnesses to prove the opinion of bishops and priests being of the same order, to be heresy, our learned Bishop Jewel cited to the contrary, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, and St. Austin himself, concluded his answer with these words: "All these and other more holy fathers, together with the Apostle Paul, for thus saying, by Harding's advice, must be held for heretics. Michael Medina, a man of great account in the council of Trent, adds to the fore-mentioned authorities, Theodorus, Romanus, Sedulius, Theophylact, with whom agree Oecumenius, the Greek scholiast, Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, Gregory, and Gratian; and after them, how many? it being once enrolled in the canon law for catholic doctrine, and thereupon taught by learned men."

"Beside, all that have labored in reforming the church, for five hundred years, have taught that all pastors, be they entitled bishops or priests, have equal authority *by God's word*: as first, the Waldenses, next Marselinus Patavius, then Wickliffe and his scholars, afterward Huss and the Hussites, and last of all, Luther, Calvin, Brentius, Bullinger, and Musculus. Among ourselves we have bishops, the Queen's professors of divinity in our universities, and other learned men consenting therein, as Bradford, Lambert, Jewel, Pilkington, Humphreys, Fulke, etc. But why do I speak of particular persons? *It is the common judgment of the Reformed churches*, of Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low

Countries, and *our own*. I hope Dr. Bancroft will not say that all these have approved that for sound doctrine, which was condemned by the general consent of the whole church, for heresy, in a most flourishing time. I hope he will acknowledge that he was overseen when he avouched the superiority which bishops have among us, over the clergy, to be *God's own ordinance*." See p. 61.

While this learned divine thus plainly shows that the exclusive divine right of bishops was not the doctrine of the church, he held that the order of bishops may be traced up to the Apostolic times; he says, Ad. Hart. Confer. p. 535, ed. 1609: "The elders ordained by the Apostles did choose one among them to be president of their company, and moderator of their actions: as, of the church of Ephesus, though it had sundry elders and pastors to guide it, yet among these sundry was there one chief, whom our Saviour calleth "the angel of the church," etc., and this is he whom afterward, in the Primitive church, the fathers called bishop."

This is evidence that our church, in saying, that, "from the apostles' times there have been bishops," does not thereby necessarily teach the doctrine of their exclusive divine right.

Dr. John Fulke, Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Answer to the Rhemish Testament, Titus, i. p. 718, ed. 1633. The Rhemish note on this verse is, "That the ordering of priests, or imposition of hands to that purpose, belongeth only to bishops . . is plain by the Apostolic practice, set down in the scriptures, viz: in the Acts, the Epistles to Timothy

and Titus . . . priests and bishops can not be ordered or consecrated but by a bishop who was himself rightly ordered or consecrated before, as Titus was by St. Paul." To this, Fulke replies: "The people had their elections, moderated by the wisdom and gravity, etc., of the clergy, among whom, for order and seemly government, there was always one principal, to whom, by long use of the church, the name of bishop or superintendent hath been applied, which room Titus exercised in Crete, Timothy in Ephesus, and others in other places. Therefore, although in the scripture a bishop and an elder is of one authority, in preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments . . . yet in government, by ancient use of speech, he is only called a bishop, which is in the Scripture called—*πρόστατος, προστὰς, or, ἡγούμενος*. That is, chief in government, to whom the ordination or consecration, by imposition of hands, was always principally committed. Not that imposition of hands belonged only to him, for the rest of the elders that were present at ordination did lay on their hands, or else the bishop did lay on his hands in the name of the rest."

In his defense of the translation of the Bible, p. 265, Park. Soc. ed., he says: "That *Episcopus*, a "bishop," was of very old times used to signify a degree ecclesiastical, higher than *presbyter*, an "elder," or "priest," we did never deny—we know it right well—we know what St. Jerome writeth upon the Epistle to Titus, chap. 1. *Idem est ergo presbyter qui episcopus*. "The same man is *presbyter*, or an "elder," or

“priest,” which is *Episcopus*, a bishop.” And before that, by the instinct of the devil, factions were made in religion, and it was said among the people, “I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas,” the churches were governed by common counsel *presbyteriorum* “of the elders.” But, afterward, when every one thought those whom he had baptized were his own, and not Christ’s, it was decreed in the whole world, that one *de presbyteris* of the elders being elected, should be set over the rest, to whom all the care of the church should pertain, and the seeds of schism should be taken away! This, and much more to this effect, writeth St. Jerome, of this distinction, in that place, and in divers other places.” p. 267. “The word *presbyter*, in the scriptures, is every ecclesiastical governor; in the fathers one degree only—that is subject to the bishop.”

William Whittaker, one of the most learned professors of divinity at Cambridge, whom Bellarmine called the “most learned heretic he had ever read;” of whom Bishop Hall remarked, “Who ever saw him without reverence, or heard him without wonder;” and Wood styled, “The desire and love of the present times—the envy of posterity, which can not bring forth a parallel;” of whom Heylin states—“That he was a zealous defender of his church against Cartwright and the Puritans;” in replying to Bellarmine, says, “We do not condemn all the order of bishops, as he falsely slanders us, but only those false bishops of this church of Rome.” And speaking of the ancient constitution that three bishops

should be present at the ordination of a bishop, he says, "That it was a good and godly sanction, and fit for those good times." But while thus approving of Episcopacy, he bears strong testimony against the notion of exclusive divine right. When Sanders appealed to Jerome's authority, for the fact of the appointment of bishops by the Apostles, Whittaker replied, "Jerome did not regard the order as changed by the Apostles, but afterward by the judgment of the church. Jerome means this when he says, 'Soon through the whole world it was decreed that one elected by the presbyters should be placed over the rest.'" Was this done by the decree of the Apostles? Jerome himself replies—"Let the presbyters know (he says) that they are subject to the authority of the bishop, by the custom of the church." From the custom of the church, saith Jerome, and not by the appointment of the Apostles; then he adds, "Let the bishops know that they are greater than the presbyters, more by custom than by truth of our Lord's appointment." "The Apostles (adds Whittaker,) did not introduce the difference, but a certain ecclesiastical custom or arrangement." Con. 4, Ques. 1, cap. 3, sect. 29.

In his works, Vol. 1, p. 509, he says, "I confess that originally there was no difference between a presbyter and a bishop;—Luther, and the other heroes of the reformation, were presbyters, even according to the ordination of the Romish church; and therefore, they were *jure divino* bishops—consequently whatever

belongs to bishops, belongs, also, *jure divino*, to themselves. As for bishops being placed over presbyters, that was a human arrangement, (*ordo humanus fuit*) for the removal of schisms, as the histories of the times testify." On the subject of succession, p. 506, after noticing Bellarmine's reference to the fathers, he replies, "In the first place I answer in general, that I might justly reject all these human testimonies, and require some clear testimony out of scripture. For this is the constant determination of all the catholic fathers, that nothing is to be received or approved in religion which does not rest on the testimony of scripture, and which can not be proved and established by the scriptures. But the fathers did not use this argument of personal succession as a firm and solid argument of itself, but as a kind of illustration of their main argument; they did not employ it to win the battle, but by way of triumph after victory. For when they had, by solid and powerful argument out of the scriptures, conquered their enemies, and established their cause, then by way of triumph, they brought forward the succession of the bishops in this manner; the bishops hold this faith as they received it from the apostles—therefore this is the catholic faith. This argument proves not that the succession of persons alone is conclusive or sufficient of itself; but only that it avails when they had first proved, (from the scriptures) that the faith they preached was the same faith the apostles had preached before them. Faith, therefore, is as it were the seal of the suc-

cession—which faith, being wanting, the naked succession of persons is like a dead carcass without the soul. The fathers, indeed, always much more regarded the succession of faith, than any unbroken series of men.”*

Dr. Andrew Willet, Prebend of Ely, in his *Synopsis Papismi*, (a work dedicated to Queen Elizabeth,) writes, p. 273—“Of the difference between bishops and priests there are three opinions: the first, of Aerius, who did hold that all ministers should be equal, and that a bishop was not, neither ought to be, superior to a priest. The second opinion is the other extreme of the Papists, who would not only have a difference, but a princely pre-eminence of their bishops over the clergy, and that by the Word of God; and they urge it to be so necessary, that they are no true churches which receive not their pontifical hierarchy. The third opinion is between both, that although this distinction of bishops and priests, as it is now received, can not be proved out of scripture, yet it is very necessary for the policy of the church, to avoid schisms, and to preserve it in unity. Of this judgment Bishop Jewel, against Harding, sheweth both Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Jerome to have been. Jerome thus writeth—‘The Apostle teacheth, evidently, that bishops and priests were the same, but that one was afterward chosen to be set over the rest as a remedy against schism.’ To this opinion of St. Jerome, subscribeth Bishop Jewel, and another most reverend prelate of our church, Archbishop Whitgift.”

* For a defense of the churchmanship of Whittaker, Fulke, and Reynolds, by that high churchman, Abp. Bramhall, see page 52.

Every godly and faithful bishop is a successor of the Apostles—we deny it not; and so are all godly and faithful pastors and ministers. The province of succession, we see, is in the preaching of the word, which appertaineth as well to other pastors and ministers as to bishops. P. 276.—Although it can not be denied but that the government of Bishops is very profitable for the preserving of unity, yet we dare not condemn the churches of Geneva, of Helvetia, Germany, and Scotland, which have received another form of ecclesiastical government—as the Papists proudly affirm that all churches which have not such bishops as theirs are to be no true churches. *But so do not our bishops and archbishops*, which is a notable difference between the bishops of the Popish church and of the Reformed churches. Wherefore, as we condemn not those Reformed churches which have retained another form of ecclesiastical government, so neither are they to censure our church for holding still the ancient regimen of bishops, purged from the ambitious and superstitious inventions of the Popish prelacy.”

Dr. William Perkins, rector of St. Andrews, Cambridge, (whose works were translated into French, German and Italian, and declared equal in point of language to the best authors,) in vol. ii, p. 302, writes—“The Catholic church, our mother, is to be sought for and found in the true visible church, the catholic marks of which are these—preaching of the word with obedience; true invocation of God the Father, in the only name of Christ, by assistance of the Holy Spirit; the right use of the sacra-

ments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. And by these shall we find the true Church of God in England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, France, etc. Page 766.—The preaching of a minister unlawfully called may be true preaching, and his sacraments true sacraments. . . . The defect of good entrance maketh not a nullity of ministerial actions." Vol. iii, p. 265.—"That ours is a true church of God is thus proved. The churches of Germany, France, Scotland, Italy, that have received the gospel, are true churches; they have the gift of discerning what is a true church of God, and what is not. Now they give the right hand of fellowship to us, and receive us as a true church of God."

Dr. Richard Field, Dean of Gloucester, whom Palmer styles profoundly learned, in his Book on the Church, Book iii, ch. 39, writes—"The power of Ecclesiastical Order, that is, the power and authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, and to perform eminent acts of gracious efficacy tending to the procuring of the eternal good of the sons of men, is equal, and the same in all those we call Presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's church and people; and that only for order sake, and for the preservation of peace, there is a limitation of the use and exercise of the same. Thereunto agree all the best learned men among the Romanists themselves, freely confessing that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct and higher order, or power of order, but a kind of dignity in office or employment only.

It is most evident, that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct power of order, but an eminence and dignity only, specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank, for order sake, and to preserve the peace and unity of the church. If bishops become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry pertains to them likewise. Who, then, dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained of presbyters in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops in those parts where they lived opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it. Surely the best learned in the church of Rome, in former times, durst not pronounce all ordinations of this nature to be void."

Says Archdeacon Francis Mason, in his *Vindiciæ*, (a work approved by Bishop Overall, and in which he had a principal hand,) p. 160, "First, if you mean by *jure divino*, that which is according to the scripture, then the pre-eminence of bishops is *jure divino*, for it hath already been proved to be according to scripture. Secondly, if by *jure divino* you mean the ordinance of God, in this sense, also, it may be said to be *jure divino*. For it is an ordinance of the Apostles, whereunto they were directed by God's Spirit, even by the Spirit of prophecy, and consequently the ordinance of God. But

if by *jure divino* you understand a law and commandment of God, binding all Christian churches, universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted; in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it to be *jure divino*." P. 173.—"The churches of Germany need not seek to foreign Bishops, because they have superintendents or bishops among themselves. And as for other places which embrace the discipline of Geneva, they also have bishops in effect. Seeing a bishop and a presbyter do not differ in order, but only in pre-eminence and jurisdiction, as yourselves acknowledge, and seeing Calvin and Beza had the order of priesthood, which is the highest order in the church of God, and were lawfully chosen, the one after the other, to a place of eminency, and indeed with jurisdiction derived unto them from the whole church where they lived, you can not with reason deny them the substance of the episcopal office."

I close with a quotation from the judicious Hooker, one of the highest churchmen of that period. Book iii, chapter 10, he writes—"I, therefore, conclude, that neither God's being author of laws for government of his church, nor his committing them unto scripture, is reason sufficient, wherefore all churches should for ever be bound to keep them without change." Book vii, p. 5.—"Wherefore, lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had authority to touch their estates, let them bear continually in mind, that it is rather the *force of custom*

whereby the Church having so long found it good to continue under the regiment of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honor them in that respect, than that any *such true and heavenly law* can be showed, by the evidence whereof it may of truth appear that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves. Let this consideration be a bridle unto them, and let it teach them not to disdain the advice of their presbyters, but to use their authority with so much the greater humility and moderation, as a sword which the church hath power to take from them."

In addition to these authorities, Dean Nowell, the Prolocutor of the Convocation which framed our Articles, William Alley, Bishop of Exeter, and Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, are referred to, among others, by Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Irenicum*, p. 438, as maintaining that "Episcopal government, though primitive, is not founded upon any unalterable Divine right."

Such were the views of the leading divines of the reign of Elizabeth. I know that some in our day will feel inclined to call these profoundly learned men, No-churchmen, Puritans, Radicals, etc. Yet these were the prominent Bishops, university Professors, and Preachers of their time—they were the men who *framed our Articles*, or else their associates.

They were all *moderate* Churchmen, and hence our articles cannot be exclusive.

And let our modern divines (who would

make such charges against these ancient defenders of the faith,) remember that no men were better qualified to distinguish truth from error; none were ever more diligent students of Holy Scripture and ancient fathers, than those I have quoted.

"Bishop Cooper," said Wood, "was furnished with all kinds of learning, almost beyond all his contemporaries." Dean Field was the best disputant of his time, and when told that his antagonists would give him no rest, replied, "that he intended to write so as his adversaries would have no mind to answer him"—which "he did," his biographer states.

Dr. Fulkes' biographer writes of him—"Of contemporary scholars none surpassed him in erudition, in a grammatical and deep acquaintance with the learned tongues, in acuteness and clearness of reasoning; none devoted more vigorous and untiring energy in supporting the bulwarks of the Church of England."

But still the conclusive evidence of these great divines as to the moderation of the Church of England will be attempted to be met by the assertion, that they were not *consistent Churchmen*.

As well might we say that the framers of the American constitution were not consistent republicans, nor devoted patriots.

But let Archbishop Bramhall, whom our opponents profess to admire, defend these noble men from such unjust charges.

"I see it lately published in print, that Dr. Whitaker, Dr. Fulke, Dr. Reynolds, were all oppugners of episcopacy. Perhaps of Popish

episcopacy; that is the abuse, not the thing; or of an absolute necessity by Divine right, of such and such an episcopacy, endowed with such and such degrees of power and pre-eminence, or of such an episcopacy as is held to differ from presbyterate in the very power of order, *but surely not of episcopacy itself*. I wondered at the impudence of the man." Vol. iii, 473.

In proof of their orthodoxy, he quotes passages of their writings, which we have already given. We thus see that this eminent controversialist did not regard it as necessary for a sound Episcopalian to hold that a bishop excels a presbyter in the power of order. And yet Bramhall was regarded as one of the highest churchmen of his time. "Episcopal divines," he says, "do not deny those churches to be true churches, wherein salvation may be had. It is charity to think well of our neighbors, and good divinity to look well to ourselves."

The extravagance which is manifested on this and kindred subjects, in portions of our church at present, we think can only be explained by the fact, that as objects in nature appear distorted to a disordered vision, and as the most wholesome food is rejected by the diseased appetite, in like manner the mind which has been allowed to imbibe unsound principles, will regard as error the plainest truths. And we are obliged to confess that the doctrines of the reformation are either little understood by some of our communion, or else little appreciated. If the attention of our church was turned more frequently "to the rock from which we were hewn," and if the

“old paths” were followed more closely, the unchurching dogma could not be maintained as at present, with confidence and apparent success. It would soon sink as a discredited novelty.

We now present, in support of the same moderate views, some of the leading divines from the time of Elizabeth to the Restoration. We do not wish to be understood as indorsing every individual sentiment expressed by these writers; but we quote them to show that while they differed on points allowable, they unite in rejecting the exclusive unchurching theory.

George Downham, Bishop of Derry, in Defense of Sermon on Divine Right of Episcopacy, preached in 1608, Book iv, chap. 6, thus writes—“Though in respect of first institution, there is small difference between an Apostolical and Divine ordinance, because what was ordained by the Apostles proceeded from God, (in which sense and no other, I do hold the Episcopal function to be of Divine ordinance, I mean in respect of the first institution,) yet in respect of perpetuity, difference by some is made between those things which be *Divine* and those which be of *Apostolici juris*; the former, in their understanding, being perpetually, generally, unalterably necessary—the latter not so. So that the meaning of my defense plainly is, that the Episcopal government hath this commendation above other forms of ecclesiastical government, that in respect of the first institution it is a Divine ordinance; but that it should be such a Divine ordinance as should be generally, perpetually, immutably

necessarily observed, so as no other form of government may in no case be admitted, I did not take upon me to maintain."

Dr. Thomas White, Prebendary of St. Paul's, in his "Way to the True Church," sec. 52, ed. 1612, in answer to the Jesuits' objection, "The Protestant church is not apostolic, because they can not derive their pedigree lineally without interruption, from the apostles, as the Roman church can from St. Peter, but are enforced to acknowledge some other, as Calvin or Luther, or some such," replies—"Our answer is, that the succession required to make a church apostolic, must be defined by the doctrine, and not by the place or persons. Wheresoever the true faith contained in the scriptures is professed and embraced, there is the whole and full nature of an apostolic church. For the external succession we care not."

Dr. Richard Crackenthorp, "a deep controversial divine, perfectly acquainted with ecclesiastical antiquity and scholastic divinity," *Defense Ang. Eccl.* p. 254—"In doctrine and profession of the orthodox faith, there is no difference between us and the reformed churches; and while we agree in this, we can easily forbear with each other as to ceremonies and government. Government has been transmitted by the Apostles, but though transmitted, it is changeable, and to be changed according to the experience and judgment of the church."

Francis White, Bishop of Ely, works, p. 64: "The true visible church is named apostolical, not because of local and personal succession

of bishops, (only or principally,) but because it retaineth the faith and doctrine of the apostles. Personal or local succession only, and in itself, maketh not the church apostolical, because hirelings and wolves may lineally succeed lawful and orthodox pastors, (Acts xx, 29, 30,) even as sickness succeedeth health, and darkness light, and a tempest fair weather—as Gregory Nazianzen affirmeth.”

Thomas Morton, “the learned, pious and painful” Bishop of Durham, in his Profession of Faith, writes—“As for our brethren the Protestants of foreign reformed churches, the most learned and judicious of themselves have bewailed their misery for want of bishops. And, therefore, God forbid that I should be so uncharitable as to censure them for no churches, for that which is their infelicity, and not their fault.”

John Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, one of the delegates to the Synod of Dort, published a work entitled, “An exhortation to a restoration of fraternal union among evangelical churches, founded upon this, that they do not differ in any fundamental article of the Catholic faith.” He says—“We account of them, (the Scottish, Irish, and all other foreign churches of the Reformation,) as our brethren in Christ, and do solemnly protest, that we entertain a holy and brotherly communion with them.”

Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich, who wrote in favor of the Divine right of episcopacy, thus explains his sense of that term, in his Defense, vol. x, page 340—“In my second an-

swer, the imputation pretended to be cast by this tenet upon all the reformed churches which want this government, I endeavored so to satisfy that I might fully decline the envy which is intended to be thereby raised against us. For which cause I professed that we do love and honor them *as sister churches, as the dear spouse of Christ*, and gave zealous testimonies of my well wishing to them. Your uncharitableness offers to choke me with those *scandalous censures and disgraceful terms which some of ours have let fall upon those churches and their eminent professors*; that *I confess it is more easy to be sorry for, than on some hands to excuse*. The error of a few may not be imputed to all. My first defense is, that no such consequent can be drawn, from our opinion; forasmuch as the Divine or Apostolical right which we hold, goes not so high, as if there were an express command, that, upon absolute necessity, there must either be episcopacy or no church, but so far only, that it both may and ought to be. How fain would you find me here in a contradiction?—that I one where reckon episcopacy amongst matters essential to the church, another where deny it to be of the essence thereof. Wherein you willingly hide your eyes, that you may not see the distinction that I make expressly between the *being* and *well-being* of a church; affirming that those churches to whom this power and facility are denied, lose nothing of *the true essence of a church*, though they miss something of their glory and perfection.”

In vol. 7, p. 88, he says: “Blessed be God,

there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sister churches of the reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine, without the least variation: their public confessions and ours, are sufficient conviction to the world of one full and absolute agreement. The only difference is, in the form of outward administration; wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess these forms not to be essential to the being of the Church, though much importing the well or better being of it, according to our several apprehensions thereof, and that we all retain a living, reverent, and loving opinion of each other, in our several ways; not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should cause any alienation of affection in us towards each other. . . . May we have the grace but to follow the truth in love, we shall in these several tracks overtake her happily in the end, and find her embracing of peace and covering us with blessedness."

Dr. Thomas Jackson, President of Corpus Christi college, Oxford,—whom Sewell styles, "the sound minded and deep thinking;" and his biographer, "The Divine of his rank and time,"—in his celebrated treatise on the church thus defines it: "The true, holy, and catholic church, is a true and real body, consisting of many parts, all really (though mystically and spiritually,) united unto one head: and by their real union with one head, all are truly and really united among themselves. Every one is so far a member of Christ's church, as he is

a member of Christ's body. He that is a true live member of the one, is a true live member of the other. He that is but an equivocal, analogical, hypocritical, or painted member of the one, is but an equivocal, hypocritical, painted, or analogical member of the other. As Christ is the temple, because the God-head dwelleth in him, so all they, and only they in whom he dwelleth by faith, are true temples of God, and live members of the catholic church." He frequently speaks of the "continental churches," and says, (vol. xii, p. 241,) "Have then reformed churches or any ministers in reformed churches erred so grossly or so dangerously as the Romish clergy on this point doth? This the greatest enemies of the foreign reformed churches can not pretend." He writes, vol. xii, p. 159, "We Protestants of reformed churches, who are, if not the only true Christians upon earth, yet the truest Christians, and the most conspicuous members of the holy, catholic church, as militant here on earth, dare not vouchsafe to bestow the name of catholic upon any papist, but with such an addition, or item, as we give the name of angel to infernal fiends, which we term Satan's angels, or collapsed angels."

Dr. Thomas Fuller, the church historian, in describing the good bishop, writes, "He ever makes honorable mention of foreign Protestant churches, even where he differs and dissents from them. The worst he wisheth for a French church is a Protestant king; not giving the left hand of fellowship to them, and reserving his right for some other. Can not Christ's

coat be of different colors, but also it must be of several seams, railing one on another, till these sisters, by bastardizing one another, make the Popish church the sole heir of all truth?"

Archbishop Ussher, a divine who had read all the fathers, whom the University of Oxford, in convocation, styled, "the most skilled in primitive antiquity, the unanswerable defender of the orthodox religion," says at the close of his life, "I have ever declared my opinion to be, that bishop and presbyter differ only in grade and not in order, and consequently that in places where bishops can not be had, the ordination by presbyters standeth valid; yet on the other side, holding as I do that a bishop's superiority in degree above a presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such presbyters as have severed themselves from those bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience, can not possibly by me be excused from being schismatical. And, however I must needs think that the churches which have no bishops are thereby become very much defective in their government, that the churches in France, who being under a popish power can not do what they would, are more excusable in this defect, than the Low Countries, which live under a free state, yet for the testifying by communion with those churches, which I do love and honor as *true members of the church universal*, I do profess that with like affection I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch minister, were I in Holland, as I

should do at the hands of the French minister if I were in Charenton." *Judgment of Archbishop of Armagh*, 1657, p. 125.

Says Ussher, as quoted by Dr. Parr in his Appendix to the Archbishop's life: "A presbyter hath the same order in specie with a bishop: *ergo*, a presbyter hath equally an intrinsic power to give orders, and is equal to him in the power of order." In 1641, Ussher published a tract entitled, "The judgment of Dr. Reynolds touching the original of Episcopacy more largely confirmed out of antiquity." We have given Dr. Reynold's judgment on p. 40.

William Forbes, bishop of Edinburgh, *Irenicum*, p. 158, maintains that "A church which retains the orthodox faith, but wants bishops, though it may be defective in its constitution, does not cease to be a true church, nor falls from that ecclesiastical authority which is possessed by churches that are governed by bishops."

Dr. John Hales, canon of Windsor, whom Bishop Pearson calls "a most prodigious example of an acute and piercing wit, of a vast and illimited knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment," in his tract on Schism, p. 15, writes, "They do but abase themselves and others, that would persuade us, that bishops of Christ's institution have any superiority over men further than of reverence, or that any bishop is superior to another further than positive order agreed on among Christians hath prescribed; for we have believed him that hath told us, that in Jesus Christ there is neither

high nor low, and that in giving honor every man should be ready to prefer another before himself; which saying cuts off all claim certainly of superiority of title of Christianity, except men think that these things were spoken only to poor and private men. Nature and religion agree in this, that neither of them had a hand in this heraldry of *secundum sub et supra*; all this comes from composition and agreement of men among themselves; wherefore this abuse of Christianity to make it lackey to ambition, is a vice for which I have no extraordinary name of ignominy, and an ordinary one I will not give it lest you should take so transcendant a vice to but be trivial."

On this passage, Bishop Stillingfleet remarks, "We see plainly he makes all difference between church officers to arise from consent of parties, and not from any divine law."

Chillingworth holds, chap. 6, sec. 39, "No one kind of external forms and orders and governments is so necessary to the being of a church, but that they may be diverse in different places, and a good and peaceable Christian may and ought to submit himself to the government of the place where he lives, whosoever he be."

We thus have shown that the articles could not have been intended to exclude non episcopal orders: from public acts having recognized the validity of these orders; by the fact that ministers thus ordained held livings in the Church of England, by virtue of these acts, for more than one hundred years after the reformation; from the circumstance that those who

compiled the articles did not hold to the exclusive divine right of episcopacy, in which view they were sustained by the great body of divines who succeeded them.

Thus far we have seen that the unchurching theory derives no support from our standards.

But the advocates of this theory appeal to *the ordinal and its preface*, in support of their views.

This portion of the prayer book we will now examine.

The preface to the ordinal thus reads: "It is evident to all men diligently reading holy scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church: bishops, priests, and deacons, etc. . . . No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest or deacon in this church except he hath had episcopal ordination or consecration."

It is maintained by our opponents, that by these words is meant, *that there can be no church without these three orders.* "Where these are not Christ's church is not."

Let us apply our rule of interpretation to this passage, "the sense of compiler or composer," and the illustration given, "What Cranmer and Ridley meant when they offered our forms of prayer, is the meaning of those forms still where they remain unaltered."

The original ordinal was framed by the reformers in the reign of Edward the sixth.

It is well known that the reformers recognized the validity of the orders and sacraments and the church character of the conti-

mental Presbyterian churches. Ample evidence of this is furnished in the Zurich letters, Parker society edition, and in their works.

In these Letters, Bishop Hooper styles his foreign brethren, "ministers of a most godly, holy church." Bishop Cox speaks of them as "most solid pillars of the church." Bishop Aylmer styles Bucer and Bullinger as "most precious lights of the church of Christ—as ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." P. 278.

Says the martyr Philpot, when his Roman tormentor asked him, "The church of Geneva, which you call the catholic church, is that which Christ prophesied of?"

"I allow the church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same, for it is catholic and apostolic, and follows the doctrine which the apostles preached; and the doctrine taught and preached in king Edward's days was according to the same." *British Reformers*, p. 138.

Said Bradford, when his Popish examiner claimed that "the Romish church had succession of bishops, and that this was an essential point."

"You say as you would have it: for if this point fail you, all the church that you go about to set up will fall down. You will not find in all the scriptures, this your essential point of the succession of bishops. In Christ's church antichrist will sit. The ministry of God's word and ministers be an essential point. But to translate this to the bishops and their succession is a plain subtilty. And, therefore, that it may be plain, I will ask you a

question. Tell me, whether that the scriptures know any difference between bishops and ministers, which ye call priests?" *Papist*: "No." *Bradford*: "Well, then go on forward and let us see what ye will get now by the succession of bishops; that is, of ministers, which can be understood of such bishops as minister not, but lord it." *Papist*: "I perceive that ye are far out of the way." *Bradford*: "If Christ or his apostles being here on earth, had been required by the prelates of the church then, to have made a demonstration of that church by succession of such high priests as had approved the doctrines which he taught, I think that Christ would have done as I do; that is, he would have alleged that which upholdeth the church, even the verity, the word of God taught and believed, not by the high priests, which of long time had persecuted it, but by the prophets and other good simple men, which perchance were counted for heretics of the church, which church was not tied to succession, but the word of God." *Fox's Acts and Monuments*.

Says Bishop Hooper, "God, for the preservation of his church, doth give unto certain persons the power and knowledge to open the scriptures; but that gift is not a power bound to any order or succession of bishops, or title of dignity."

The views of Cranmer, Cox, Redmayn, and Robertson, compilers of the ordinal, are shown to be decidedly against the unchurching theory, in Burnet's Appendix to Hist. of Ref. Record, 21, p. 114.

Bishop Ridley, another of the compilers of the ordinal, and regarded as the wisest man that promoted the reformation—writes, “My daily prayer is, as God doth know, and by God’s grace shall be as long as I live in this world, for you my dear brethren, that are fled out of your own country, because you will rather forsake all worldly things than the truth of God’s word. It is ever the same that I used to make to God, for all *those churches abroad* through the world which have forsaken the kingdom of Antichrist, and professed openly the purity of the gospel of Jesus Christ.” Hone, his biographer, remarks upon this, p. 130: “The free recognition of the reformed churches abroad, which had not the advantage of the episcopacy, as being yet integral parts of the church of Christ, is worthy of notice here, as indeed in all the reformers’ writings.”

Of the revisers under Elizabeth, we have seen that Parker and Grindall held similar views. Says Bishop Pilkington, a reviser, “So stands the succession of the church, not in miters, palaces, lands, or lordships, but in teaching pure doctrine, and rooting out the contrary.” *Works*, p. 603.

Archbishop Sandys, member of the Convocation of 1571, writes, *Sermons*, p. 67: “The church of God is built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets. The true church hath her marks whereby she is known—the gospel truly preached, the sacraments sincerely ministered, discipline duly executed.” P. 372—“Where nothing is taught but according to the written word; where the sacraments are sin-

cerely ministered ; where the rod and scepter of government is used, there is Christ—there is the church. P. 379, speaking of the Pope's usurpation, he says, " The church could hide itself in no corner of any kingdom in the whole world, but his tyranny found it out, to vex it, to persecute it, to spoil it; what blood he hath shed, what murder he hath committed in these latter days, England, Scotland, Flanders, and France, can sufficiently record. By this it is evident to all men's eyes, how the church, in the midst of this wicked world, is tossed like a ship upon the sea." It is evident from these words, that Sandys recognized the churches on the continent as true churches.

P. 95, he says, " In public doctrine touching the substance of religion, we all agree in one truth; we all build upon one foundation, Christ Jesus, slain and offered up for our full redemption, according to the doctrine of the scriptures. So much the greater pity it is that there should be such dissent in matters of small importance, in rites and ceremonies, that by contention in such things, the cause of the gospel should be hindered, Christ's adversaries strengthened, and his church offended. The ministry can not be well executed without her rites—which rites are left indifferent to every policy, so that they be not disagreeing from the word—so that they tend unto edification—so that they be seemly, and according to decent order."

Of the revisers under James I, we have seen that Whitgift, Bancroft, Bilson, Bridges, Overall, and Field, did not hold to the absolute necessity

of episcopal ordination. We add the testimony of two other bishops, of the same committee of revision of 1603.

Says Bishop Andrews, in answer to De Moulin's 3d Letter, "You demand, then, whether your churches sin against the divine right? I did not say it: this only I said, that your churches wanted somewhat that is of divine right; wanted, but not by your fault, but by the iniquity of the times." To 2d Letter, "Nevertheless, if our form be of divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is not salvation without it, or *that a church can not consist without it*. He must needs be stone blind that sees not churches standing without it; he must needs be made of iron and hard-hearted, that denies them salvation. We are not made of that metal—we are none of those iron sides; we put a wide difference betwixt them. Somewhat may be wanting that is of divine right (at least in the external government,) and yet salvation may be had. This is not to damn anything, to prefer a better thing before it; this is not to damn your church, to recall it to another form that all antiquity was better pleased with, i. e. to ours; and this when God will grant the opportunity, and your estate may bear it."

The learned Bingham, remarks upon this language of Andrews, Vol. ix, p. 41, "This is the case of the French church, which Bishop Andrews and his followers allow to have *all the necessary and essential notes of a true church, though episcopal government was never settled among them.*"

Writes Bishop Babington, Works, p. 240 :
 "They are the true successors of the apostles that succeed in virtue, holiness, truth, etc., not that sit on the same stool. Faith cometh by hearing, saith St. Paul, (not by succession) and hearing cometh, (not by legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop) but by the word of God."

Not one of the compilers of the Prayer Book, in 1549 and 1553, nor of the reviewers of 1562, nor in 1603, held to the doctrine of the exclusive divine right of episcopacy. Bp. Andrews the highest churchman of them all, merely asserting, (as we have seen,) that episcopacy is necessary, not to the *being* of a church, but to its *better being*, where it may be had.

But, notwithstanding all the evidence presented in regard to the moderate character of the Church of England, it is maintained by the friends of exclusive divine right, as a last argument, *that by the passage of the act of uniformity, in 1662, and the changes made in the ordinal, and its preface, at that time, this church then gave her deliberate and settled judgment in favor of the exclusive view.*

By this act, no person unless episcopally ordained was allowed to hold a living in the English church. Concerning this act, Burnet remarks, Hist. of his Times, vol. i, p. 332 :
 "Another point was fixed by the Act of Uniformity, which was more at large formerly ; those who came to England from the foreign churches had not been required to be re-ordained among us ; but now all who had not episcopal ordination, were made incapable of holding any ecclesiastical benefice."

From this act, and the consequent changes in the ordinal, two exclusive views are asserted—

I. *That without a bishop there can be no true church; and—*

II. *That episcopal ordination is essential not merely to the perfection but to the validity of a ministry.*

Let us put each of these views to the test.

Here we observe, first and generally:—It is evident from the statement of the commissioners of revision that they *intended* to change no principle of the original ordinal. In their preface, by Bishop Sanderson, they say—“His Majesty, out of his pious inclination to give satisfaction (so far as could reasonably be expected), to all his subjects, of what persuasion soever, did graciously condescend to a revision. In which review, we have endeavored to observe the like moderation, as we find to have been used in the like case in former times. And, therefore, of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence or secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the church of England, or indeed of the whole catholic church of Christ . . . For we are fully persuaded in our judgments, (and we here profess it to the world) that the book, as it stood before established by law, doth not contain anything in it contrary to the word of God, or to sound doctrine, or which a godly man may not with a sound conscience use and submit to; or which is not fairly defensible against any that shall oppose the same, if it shall be allowed

such just and favorable construction, as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings."

We have already proved that it was the established doctrine of the church of England, that episcopacy was not essential to the being of a church, and that non-episcopal ordinations were valid; and as the commissioners declare that they have altered no established doctrine, the view of their church remained the same on this point as before.

That the Church of England passed neither of these judgments will also be shown by the testimony of standard divines, who lived after these changes were made.

I. *Did the Church of England unchurch all communions without bishops?* This was not the view of Bishop Sanderson, one of the leading commissioners, and ablest men of that body. He describes the church to be, "The whole company of all those, throughout the world, who, by their doctrine and worship, do outwardly make profession of the name of Christ; this we call the universal visible church, or the "catholic Christian church." He often speaks of the "Protestant churches" of England and the continent, as agreeing in the "substance of faith," and constituting "particular visible churches." *Hooker's Collection*, p. 213-15—"So, then, brethren, (in the apostolical use of the word) are Christians, and the brotherhood the whole society of Christian men, the system and body of the whole visible church of Christ. I say the visible church, because there is indeed another brotherhood more excellent than this,

whereof we now speak, consisting of such only as shall undoubtedly inherit salvation—called by some of the ancients, the church of God's Elect, and by some later writers, the Invisible Church Whoever liveth in the communion of the visible church, being baptized into Christ, and professing the name of Christ, we must own him for a Christian, and take him as one of the brotherhood, and as such an one, love him, for so is the duty here: 'Love the brotherhood.' Ser. vol. ii, p. 83. There is, I confess, much reverence to be given to the writings of the godly ancient fathers, more to the canons and decrees of general and provincial councils, and not a little to the judgment of learned, sober, and godly divines, of later and present times, within our own and *other reformed churches*." And speaking of Luther and Calvin, he says:—"Worthy instruments they were, both of them, of God's glory, and such as did excellent service to the church in their times, whereof we yet find the benefit; and we are unthankful if we do not bless God for it, and therefore, it is *an unsavory thing for any man to jeer at their names, whose memories ought to be precious*." Ser. 1, p. 552.

How different are the sentiments of this eminent man, and zealous churchman, on this point, from the new divinity so popular in portions of our church at present!

On the accession of William III, to the throne, 1688, the house of bishops agreed upon an address of thanks for his zeal in behalf of the Church of England, anticipating that there-

by, "the interests of the Protestant religion in *all other Protestant churches* would be better secured;" hereby acknowledging the church character of Presbyterian communions.

That Bishop Pearson, the greatest divine on the commission of 1662, and of the highest authority in our Church, was not an exclusive churchman, we conclude from his expounding the promise, Matt. xxviii, 20, (the main text of the advocates of exclusive Episcopal succession), as one applying *to the church at large, and not to the Apostles only.*

He writes on the Creed, Article ix, p. 512, Appleton's edition:—"This promise giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ. 'Where two or three are met together in the name of Christ, there he is in the midst of them,' (Matt. xviii, 20); *and thereby they become a church*; for they are as a builded house, and the son within that house; wherefore seeing Christ doth promise his presence unto *the Church, even unto the end of the world*, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the church, until that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is the city of the Lord of Hosts, the city of our God. God will establish it forever, (Ps. xlviii, 8), as the great prophet of our church hath said.

"Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the church hath been propounded as an object of our faith in every age of Christianity; and so shall it be unto the end of the world. *For those who are believers are the church.*"

Dr. Horneck mentions the principles upon which a union among Protestants might be effected; among others—"That the differing persons do not condemn one another for those differences—there being nothing that has done religion more hurt than men's condemning one another for things to which Christ and his apostles have affixed no condemnation. That notwithstanding the little differences that are among them, *they make one church*, and endeavor after the welfare and prosperity of it, and join together in public prayer, and in the sacrament of the eucharist, which is the badge and symbol of fraternity and unity." It was an object near his heart that peace and love might prevail among Protestants . . . and he regarded those who were taking measures for reconciling the Protestant churches one with another as engaged in a blessed work." Hone's *Lives*, vol. ii, p. 359.

Dr. Claggett, Answer to Bellarmine, p. 166 : "But some things are necessary to the being of a church; and they are, the acknowledgement of the one Lord, and the professing the one faith, and admission into the state of Christian duties and privileges by the one baptism. And this is all that I can find absolutely necessary to the being of a church, inasmuch as the apostle saith—'We are all baptized into one body.' *The Church of England doth not unchurch those parts of Christendom that hold the unity of the faith.*

Dean Sherlock writes—"I do allow Episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, and the truly ancient and catholic government of the

church, of which more hereafter; but yet in this very book I prove indubitably and at large, that in case of necessity, when bishops cannot be had, a church may be a truly catholic church, and such as we may and ought to communicate with, without bishops, in vindication of some foreign reformed churches who have none; and therefore I do not make Episcopacy so absolutely necessary to catholic communion, as to unchurch all churches which have it not. The church of England does not deny that in case of necessity the ordination of presbyters may be valid." See Bishop Gibson's *Preservative*, vol. iii, p. 410.

Dr. John Scott, author of "The Christian Life," a text book in our Gen. Seminary, vol. iii, p. 313: "A community of Christians may be a *true* part of the Catholic church, and in communion with it, *though it hath no Episcopacy* . . This instituted government is necessary to the *perfection* of a church, yet it doth not follow that it is necessary to the *being* of it."

We confirm this testimony by the views of four of the most eminent Primates of England, who lived after the act of uniformity.

Archbishop Sancroft, the leader of the Non-Jurus, in his "Articles recommended to all the bishops in his metropolitan jurisdiction," in 1688. Article XI enjoins on them—"warmly and most affectionately to join with us in daily and fervent prayer to the God of peace for a universal and blessed union *of all reformed churches* at home and abroad, against our common enemies, (the Romanists,) and that all they who do confess the holy name of our dear

Lord, and do agree in the truth of his body, may also meet in one holy communion, and live in perfect union and godly love."

Writes Archbishop Tillotson :—"Ought not the great matters wherein we are agreed on our union in the doctrines of the Christian religion, and in all the necessary articles of that faith which was once delivered to the saints, in the same sacraments, and in all the substantial parts of Christian worship, and in the great duties and virtues of the Christian life, be of greater force to unite us, than difference in doubtful opinions, and in little rites and ceremonies of worship to divide and break us? Are not the things about which we differ, in their nature indifferent—that is, things about which there should be no difference among wise men? Are they not at a great distance from the life and essence of religion, and rather good and bad, as they tend to the peace and unity of the church, or are made use of for schism and faction, than either necessary or evil in themselves." Works, ii, 248.

Says Archbishop Wake, in a letter to Conrayer, dated, *Corydon House, July 9, 1724* :—"I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an Episcopal church, which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian church from the very times of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm that where the ministry is not Episcopal, there is no church nor any true administration of the sacraments. And very many there are among us who are very zealous for the Episcopacy, and yet dare not go so far as to annul the or-

dinances of God performed by any other ministry." Mac. Mosheim, ii, 337. See also, p. 21.

Writes Archbishop Secker :—"The church of England pretends not indeed, absurdly to be the whole catholic church, but is undoubtedly a sound, excellent member of it. Christ's church is the whole number of those who believe in him. How much soever they may differ in opinions or practices, yet they are one in all things essential. How wide so ever they may be dispersed throughout the world, they shall at last be gathered together unto him.—What the catholic faith is, may be gathered from the Apostles' writings, contained in the New Testament, and at so great a distance of time we can learn it with certainty no where else." On Catechism, p. 121.

Not one Archbishop of Canterbury can be found to sustain the unchurching theory, from Cranmer to Sumner, with the exception of Laud, and perhaps of Potter. We have given the testimonies of all the eminent Primates, and their almost unanimous consent is a fair index of the view of their church on this topic.

II. Our next inquiry is—*Did the church of England, at the restoration, declare all orders invalid, except those conveyed by bishops?* For there are those who, while they acknowledge the church character of communions without bishops, deny the *validity* of their *ordinations*. That she did not, is evident from the fact, that the act of uniformity which is relied on to sustain this position plainly excepts from its influence certain foreign churches, and therefore did not intend to

invalidate non-episcopal orders in the church general. A proviso in the act thus reads :—
 “ Provided that the penalties in this act shall not extend to the foreigners, nor aliens of the foreign reformed churches allowed or to be allowed by the king’s majesty, his heirs and successors in England.”

We can not believe that these churches placed by law under the superintendence of the bishops of London were allowed to remain without *ministers!* without *sacraments!* and thus given over to the uncovenanted mercies of God! The character of the divines of that time forbids the supposition. And we may justly infer, from the allowance of these non-episcopal ministrations, that they were regarded by the church as valid, though irregular.

The design of the act of uniformity was not to pass a new and different judgment upon Presbyterian orders, from that held by the church for more than a century previous, but as it declares—“to settle the peace of the church, and to produce an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God.”

By making Episcopal ordination the only lawful ordination in England, the church did not intend thereby to invalidate the orders and sacraments of other churches.

Archbishop Sharp declared in a speech in parliament, *Life*, vol. i. page 377—“ If I were abroad, I would willingly communicate with the Protestant churches, wherever I should happen to be.” He could not, of course, do this, consistently, if his church denied the validity of non-episcopal orders. And the

testimony of other eminent divines clearly proves, that the church of England did not deny their validity.

Bishop Cosin, a prominent commissioner, and a strenuous churchman, in his letter to Cordel, p. 234, styles the French communions "reformed churches;" and to those who would refuse communion with them for "their want of Episcopal ordination," he says—"If upon this ground we renounce the French, we must upon the same ground renounce all the ministers of Germany besides; and then what will become of the Protestant party? If the church and kingdom of England have acknowledged them, (as they have . . .) why should we, who are but private persons, utterly disdain their communion." Page 230:—"I conceive that the power of ordination was restrained to bishops, rather by apostolical practice and the perpetual customs and canons of the church, than by any absolute precept, that either Christ or his apostles gave about it. Nor can I meet with any convincing argument to set it upon a more high and Divine institution." "There have been both learned and eminent men as well in former ages as in this, and even among Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, who have held and maintained it for good and passable Divinity, that presbyters have the intrinsical power of ordination, *in actu primo*;" though, as he goes on to say, "for the avoidance of schism, and the preserving of order and discipline in the church, they have from the first been restrained from exercising their power in *actu secundo*:" so that now their exercise of

this power is irregular and canonically void ; though "not void simply in itself, and in the nature of the thing." He quotes in support of this view, among others, Jewel, Hooker, Field, and Mason, whose testimony we have already given. We thus see that this distinguished divine took the same view as his brethren in the reign of Elizabeth.

By requiring Presbyterian ministers to be re-ordained, before being admitted to livings, it by no means follows, that the church of England thereby invalidated their former orders.

Archbishop Bramhall does not appear to have so regarded it, when he inserted in his letters of orders to Parkinson, a Presbyterian minister—"We do not annul your former orders which you may have, nor determine their validity ; much less do we condemn all the sacred ordinations of the foreign churches abroad, whom we leave to their proper judge ; but we do merely what was wanting according to the canons of the church of England, and provide for the peace of this church." See his *Life*, prefixed to his works, ed. Dublin, 1677.

This was wise Archbishop Leighton's view of re-ordination.

Says Burnet, *History of his own times*, vol. i, page 253—"Leighton did not regard orders given without bishops, null and void. He considered forms of government as not settled by such positive laws as are unalterable ; but only by apostolical practices, which authorized episcopacy as the best form, though not necessary to the being of a church. He thought that every church might make such rules of

ordination as they pleased; that they might re-ordain all that came to them from any other church; that the re-ordaining a priest ordained in any other church, imported no more but that they received him into orders according to their own rules, and did not infer the annulling the orders he had already received." With these views, in compliance with the act of uniformity, he, with Sharp and others, consented to receive re-ordination.

Bishop Burnet, as we have seen, page 31, says, that "no bishop in Scotland, during his stay in that kingdom, did so much as desire any of the Presbyterians to be re-ordained."

Dean Comber, as quoted by Bishop Brownell, remarks, on the preface to the ordinal—"In this passage our church censures not the new way, nor condemns those that are foreign, but secures the old way, and takes care to oblige her own members, declaring that none shall be accounted a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in *this church of England*, nor exercise any of these functions *here*, unless according to the primitive discipline he be first called, tried, and examined, and then ordained according to this form, or hath had lawful, that is, episcopal ordination."

Says the learned Bingham, Works, vol. ix, p. 296—"Some reckon the business of re-ordination a great charge against the act of uniformity; because it obliges every beneficiary to receive episcopal ordination according to the form and rites of the church of England. But what harm there is in this, I confess, I never yet could see, and I am sure there is

nothing in it contrary to the principles or practice of the church of Geneva, or of the whole French church . . . Now if it be lawful, by the rules of the church of Geneva, for a minister to receive a new solemn ordination, when he is translated from one church to another, why can not men in England consent to receive a new ordination, when the law requires it, in order to settle themselves regularly in any church? especially when it is for the sake of peace and union, and to take all manner of doubtfulness and scruples from the people. I dispute not now, whether their former ordination were valid; it is certain, they are not more valid than those of Geneva; nor can they themselves think them more valid than the ministers of Geneva think theirs; wherefore, if it be lawful at Geneva for a minister to receive new ordination, because the laws require it, I do not see what can make it unlawful in England to submit to the same thing, in compliance with the law, when men have no other way to settle themselves in any cure; let their opinions of their former ordination be what it will, which comes not into the present dispute. For even supposing their former ordination to be valid, I show, they may submit to a new ordination without sin . . . Generally, the French ministers who come over into England are ready to receive episcopal ordination, when they can have it; which is an argument that they are neither enemies to episcopal power and jurisdiction itself, nor think it contrary to the rules of their church, nor the rules of the gospel, to receive a new ordination."

This eminent churchman, who lived shortly after the passing of the act of uniformity, and whose works are of high authority, plainly declares that it was not necessary for a Presbyterian minister, by receiving re-ordination, thereby to condemn his former orders as invalid, but that he submitted to this act merely for the sake of peace and union.

If a person can be ordained with these views, certainly the ordainer can administer ordination on the same principles; and how unreasonable, then, to hold that re-ordination in our church *necessarily* implies the *invalidity* of orders formerly received. Our church no where *forbids* her members to hold to the invalidity of non-episcopal orders, while, on the other hand, she no where *asserts* or *affirms* this opinion. It *may* be entertained as a *private sentiment*, but is not to be regarded as the expressed judgment of our church.

That zealous churchman, Bishop Heber, in his letter to Dr. Smith, a Lutheran minister, on re-ordination, (See Last days of Heber, Appendix, p. 192), takes the same view. He says, "If a preacher, ordained in the method practised in Germany, sees a marked advantage to Christ's cause in a closer alliance with his Episcopalian brethren, I see not that he dishonors his previous commission by seeking our prayer and blessing in the form which *we* think most conformable to God's will. And the humility is, surely, anything but blamable, which stoops for a time to even an inferior degree and inferior duties than those which he has already exercised. . . . Were I to re-

turn to Germany, I would again, as before, humbly and thankfully avail myself of the preaching and sacramental ordinances of the Lutheran Evangelical church, not doubting that they are a true church of Christ, and that the Spirit of God is with them, as I trust he is with us also. . . . I gladly admit their divines (as I should desire myself to be admitted in Germany or Holland,) to the communion of our church, and to all that interchange of good will and good offices, (as in the case of the missionary societies of our church), which is essential to the carrying on the gospel work in concert."

The testimony of Bishop White, we regard as conclusive, as to the opinion of our church on this point. We have before given it, but as it is important we repeat it. *"To some it may seem inconsistent with the moderation here affirmed, that in the church of England, and in this church, no minister ordained in another communion not episcopal, and conforming to the institutions of either of the said churches, can be admitted to its ministry without episcopal ordination. But there is no inconsistency in these maxims. These churches do not judge of the sufficiency of peculiar circumstances, in regard to others. But they perceive no such circumstances in the relations in which they stand. Therefore, for them to dispense, within their respective bounds, with the difference of grade in the ministerial character, when they think that they discern clear evidence of it in the appointment of the apostles, would be conduct which they could not defend on any principle of consistency."* See page 20.

But it may be inquired how, in the face of this evidence, many individuals can hold the exclusive view ; positively asserting that Episcopacy is of exclusive Divine right, and that without this order there can be no church?

It will be useful to trace the rise and progress of this error.

The pride of our nature is the root of all dogmatism, bigotry, and exclusiveness.

“Deep is the sea, and deep is hell, but pride mineth deeper :
It is coiled as a poisonous worm about the foundations of the soul.
If thou expose it in thy motives, and track it in thy springs of
thought,
Complacent in its own detection, it will seem indignant virtue :
Deep calleth unto deep, and mountain overtoppeth mountain,
And still shalt thou fathom to no end the depth and height of
pride.”

We find this spirit of self-exaltation of course, in Popery, the religion of the natural heart. *She* carries out the unchurching theory to its proper results, and consigns all without her limits to perdition.

But how came the exclusive system into reformed Christendom? Who introduced this troublesome spirit among us?

We are glad to know that the Episcopal church is not responsible for this innovation.

History lays it at the door of the Presbyterian church of Geneva.

That the church of Geneva first advanced exclusive claims, appears from the following passage from Strype's life of Whitgift, vol. 2, p. 156, which contains a remarkable letter from this Archbishop to Beza, the distinguished successor of Calvin.

“In this year, 1594, came forth a remark-

able book written by Dr. Bancroft, the Archbishop's chaplain, in which he declarss it his intention "to establish men's minds in that giddy age, from running up and down after every start-up hither and thither, to seek new platforms of church government, whereas we have one of our own, which he said, was in his conscience truly apostolical and far to be preferred before any other that was received at that day, by any reformed church in Christendom."

And (in respect of foreigners interfering themselves in our English church affairs) "that it was also great presumption for any minister of any of the reformed churches to take upon them to censure or direct the practice of this church of England, reformed by men of as much or more learning than themselves. And here he mentioned particularly Calvin and Beza, under whose wings the new reformers here did shroud themselves."

"That in the year 1566, Beza had intermeddled in the affairs of the church of England where he had no reason; that it was a very insolent part for him to take so much upon him."

† "This work gave offence to Beza, insomuch that he took notice of it in a letter to Archbishop Whitgift, though no question these were some of the thoughts and instructions of Bancroft's patron, the said Archbishop. Yea, he took occasion himself about this time to tell Beza (though after a very civil and courteous manner,) how he meddled beyond his measure, and expostulated very closely with him about these church matters, being out of his jurisdiction."

"In 1594, this year the Archbishop wrote a large letter in Latin to him, declaring plainly his mind, and gently blaming him for siding so much with such as created no little disturbance in this kingdom and church. And herein also vindicating Saravia and Sutcliffe, two learned men of this church, who had written in the behalf of the order of the episcopacy and against Beza's doctrine of the equality of ministers of the Gospel and a ruling presbytery. Whereat the foreigners took offense, and complained of the writers to the Archbishop, who showed him in this, his answer, that he himself had given the first occasion by the unhandsome reflections he had made, more than once in print, against the episcopal government of this church."

"I think it worthy to lay this letter before the reader's eye, showing so much of the Archbishop's wisdom, learning, moderation, respect for foreign reformed churches, and his devotedness to the service of this church."

"He congratulated that republic, in that he understood from him, that that firmness and constancy of mind, in the profession of the truth of the Gospel yet remained in their churches. He regretted that the labors of some had been employed against their brethren, and not against their common enemy, the Roman antichrist."

"That God himself was witness, how nothing was done in that behalf by them of England, but with the greatest unwillingness, having been long and much provoked by the less brotherly writings and admonitions of others.

"That Beza had complained that the disturbances in the church of England was laid to the charge of them of Geneva, and particularly of him, that he would have all episcopacy abolished, and would obtrude the Genevan discipline upon all churches."

"But, my dear Beza, mind what I do candidly and sincerely, as in the Lord, answer to this your expostulation."

"That from that very time, almost, wherein that discipline which they at Geneva espoused, first sprung up and was received, we, here in England, saw no stone by them unturned, to render it commended to all the rest of the world, *for the only and genuine government of the church which Christ had instituted, the apostles observed, and which all the churches (if they would set up a solid reformation,) were bound to restore.* For much of that sort was diligently and every where inculcated by Calvin, Daneus, Sadeel Ursin, and set forth by him (Beza) in many theses there propounded, in his annotations, in the book of confession, and in his own epistles."

"In effect, he condemned all other reformed churches which did not follow or admit this form of government. Especially when in his letters, he asserted, that the churches of their government seemed to them the *essential* form; and yet in the mean time they did not acknowledge any other for the *lawful polity of Christ* but that which then flourished among them."

"That he had gone further, that he had disputed somewhere, *that the purity of doctrine*

could scarcely be had to any purpose without that discipline, saying, "Wherefore should we receive one part of the word and reject the other."

"That the manner of his writing, although it was done with the greatest prejudice of the church of England, might have more equally been borne, if he had not declared the need of such a regiment, more especially *in the British churches.*"

"That they (the governors of the church) were forced at last, as well for the care of defending the truth itself, as to allay the heats of contention, to oppose themselves to those furies, truly so called, (referring to some writers in England,) in one or two books set forth in our own mother tongue, wherein they (the Archbishop and clergy,) minded nothing more than to vindicate the form of government of the English church, and of the liturgy, from the calumnies of those men, in the mean time, *no where opposing the discipline of any other church, or in the least reflecting thereon.*"

"But behold! while we hope all things were a little more pacified, your book, my friend Beza, of a threefold episcopacy, anno 1590, was sent into this island, with your letter to Lausanne, a Scot, which set a new flame to the torch, which before was almost quenched. In which epistle you wrote thus, 'I am wont, by very good right, (unless I am much mistaken) to call that false episcopacy, not a human power, but a *Satanical tyranny*, which, as it heretofore destroyed the church, so now indeed it hindereth, at least, its restoration from the miserable state of Germany, and of the coun-

try nearer you. I wish Scotland may seasonably enough be sensible of it.' By that nearer miserable country you did not obscurely point out England. And in that book of yours, you contended much, that your discipline might be esteemed for *divine*, and so be necessarily received everywhere, but also, that *all episcopal degree* should be driven away and banished from the church, for a *human and pernicious invention*."

"And now, my dear brother, I beseech you, what is, if these things are not—to *obtrude the Genevan discipline upon all churches, and to have a mind to abolish all bishops*,—how that these and more such like things, to be so unkindly and sharply spoken against an order of the English church, (that had deserved better things,) do you not think that these are just causes for us to bear them somewhat heavily."

"And yet there had been none among them, in the mean time, found, (although touched with manifold wrongs,) that either in Latin or English, took upon him, professedly to shake the form of that discipline, which they were so mightily fond of, and for the sake of which all these things were done. For the purpose of Dr. Saravia to assert degrees among the ministers of the gospel, was wholly undertaken without the injury and prejudice of any particular church."

"And when Dr. Sutcliffe had prepared something in our mother tongue concerning the presbytery, an Italian book writ in Latin in the midst of England, against the English, seemed to him worthy to be refuted. This (as

the Archbishop could remember,) was the first book among the English, in this land set forth, whether in English or Latin, which undertook a dispute against that presbytery which flourished among them there abroad; however, for a long time before, this church was hardly dealt withal by them on that account.

That their state of Geneva suffered to be printed in the English language, amongst other obnoxious works, the theological theses whereby the *whole episcopal order* was traduced for *an adulterine and false ministry*."

"In short, we wonder why this church of England wherein are thousands of godly persons and learned ministers, a church which God hath appointed, now a great while, a safe refuge for so many exiles, and an aid to other afflicted and persecuted churches; that this church, I say, hath been thought worthy to be exposed freely, to be made a laughing stock to all men, and to be torn to pieces by most unworthy contumelies. And shall it not be lawful, *salva charitate*, for her alone so much as to mutter against all this? What in all this hath been acted by us less brotherly? What, but when necessity itself, at least, required? Unless we should be wanting to ourselves, to the church, and so also to truth itself. For we make no doubt but that the episcopal degree (which we bear,) is an institution apostolical and divine, and so hath always been held by a continuous course of times from the apostles to this very age of ours."

"Do you think it fit, grave sir, that we, so often challenged, as it were, to the combat,

and by so many books set forth to the disparagement of this church, after so long a silence, should answer nothing? That Dr. Saravia should answer nothing? That Dr. Sutcliff should reply nothing? as though we should acknowledge all these things as truths, and of that nature that no sufficient answer should be given to them."

"We see, therefore, that we, who are thus placed in this school of exercise, must necessarily wrestle it out."

"Certainly, whether you regard the sayings or doings of our men, I think, for my part, no deeds or words more unworthy could be invented than those, which on this account now for a long time we have suffered. But if any thing more grievous come to pass from thence, (which God forbid,) yet we trust to be freed from all blame before God's tribunal, on whom the necessity of defending the truth and ourselves was thus first imposed by others. But I would have you, worthy sir, persuade yourself of this, that there is no mortal man more studious than myself for the peace of the church, nor who, from his soul, more truly wisheth that every particular church would mind its own business and not prescribe the laws of rites and the manner of government to others. For this is the apple of contention, if anything else be, which bringeth forth that unhappy estrangement among brethren, (how little soever it be anywhere discerned,) and will still bring it forth, unless it be timely prevented."

"Most learned and most dear brother in Christ, farewell. February, 1594. Your most

loving brother and fellow servant in Christ, John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury in England."

From this letter, (from which we have omitted some unimportant passages,) we learn that Whitgift was a moderate churchman; that while he was deeply attached to his own church, which he regarded as apostolical, he did not think it his duty to interfere with the rights of other churches, not episcopal—that he recognized the continental churches as true and valid churches, though differing from his own in form of government.

He charges the church of Geneva with interfering with the concerns of the English church, laboring to change its government, with claiming that theirs was an apostolical and divine institution, while that was human and pernicious—that it was not until after repeated charges of this nature, to the great injury of the English church, that her divines had taken up the pen in her defense—that while they had sustained their own institutions, it was not to the disparagement or injury of any other church—that the evils arising from exclusive, uncharitable claims, could not with justice be laid to the charge of his church. This letter, while it does honor to the head and heart of Whitgift, contains clear evidence that *high church presbyterianism* preceded *high church episcopacy*; Beza like a true high churchman, holding that his was "the only and genuine government of the church, which Christ had instituted, the apostles observed, and which all churches were bound to restore."

That his form was "*essential* and divine," while other forms were "human and unlawful," and that "purity of doctrine could scarcely be had to any purpose without the presbyterian discipline." High churchmen of all denominations use nearly the same language.

To Archbishop Laud belongs the distinction of introducing the exclusive view into the English church.

Whitgift's letter brings the history of this doctrine down to the year 1594. Previous to that, we learn from his testimony, that it had not been advanced by divines of the English church.

Jewell had published his Apology, Bishop Cooper his Admonition, 1589, Bishop Bridges his Defense, 1587, Saravia had written on the Degrees of the Ministry, 1590, Sutcliff on Presbytery, 1591, Bancroft on the Discipline, 1593, Bishop Bilson on the Perpetual Government of the Church, 1593,—all previous to the appearance of this letter, and most with the approbation and under the direction of Whitgift. Whitgift acquits these divines of any intention to disparage or reproach the government of any other church. Their object was to defend their own against the attacks of opponents. Hooker published his immortal work the same year, 1594. From that time until 1604, we meet with no writer advancing exclusive claims.

Says Hallam, "Bishops Neyle and Laud began by preaching the divine right, as it is called, or absolute indispensability of episcopacy, a doctrine, of which the first traces, as I

apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth's reign. . . . The divine right of episcopacy is said to have been laid down by Bancroft, in his famous sermon at Paul's cross, 1588, but I do not find any thing in it to that effect." *Con. Hist.* p. 236, Harper's last edition.

King James began his reign in 1603. He declared as his opinion, "It is granted to every Christian king, prince, and commonwealth, to prescribe, within its own jurisdiction, that external form of church government which approaches as much as possible to its own form of civil administration."

The exclusive Divine right of episcopacy was first maintained by Laud, on taking his degrees at Oxford, in 1604.

Says Prynne, in his *Life of Laud*, p. 2—"In July, 1604, he proceeded Bachelor of Divinity, his suppositions were taken verbatim out of Bellarmine, and he then maintained there could be no church without diocesan bishops; for which Dr. Holland, (then Dr. of the chair,) openly reprehended him in the schools, for a seditious person, who would unchurch the Reformed churches beyond the seas, and sow a division between us and them, who were brethren, by this novel Popish doctrine." Hallam confirms this statement, *Con. Hist.* p. 227: "Laud had been reproved by the university of Oxford, for maintaining that there could be no church without bishops, which was thought to cast a bone of contention between the church of England and the Reformers on the continent."

Lord Bacon remarks:—"Some indiscreet

persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the churches abroad; and that so far that some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers." Vol. i, p. 417.

The Puritans had before this introduced the unchurching theory from Geneva to England. Says Cartwright, as quoted by Hallam—"The discipline of Christ's church that is *necessary* for all times is delivered by Christ, and set down in Holy Scripture. Therefore, the true and lawful discipline is to be fetched from thence, and from thence alone, and that which resteth upon other foundation ought to be esteemed unlawful and counterfeit." Again, "We offer to show the discipline to be a part of the gospel, and therefore to have a common cause; so that in the repulse of the discipline, the gospel receives a check." "I speak of the discipline as a part of the gospel, and therefore neither under or above the gospel."

"The discipline being, as it is propounded and offered to be proved, a part of the gospel, must needs arm the Lord against the refuser." Lib. ii, p. 1, 4. See Keble's Hooker, v. i, p. 388.

Says Hallam, p. 130—"Whitgift and Hooker rested the controversy, in the main, on the indifference of church discipline and ceremonies. It was not till afterwards that the defenders of the established order found that one claim (of Divine right) was best met by another."

Our examination has shown us that Laud was the first divine of the established church who advanced this claim. Keble, in his preface to

Hooker, acknowledges that "Jewel, Whitgift, Bishop Cooper, and others to whom the management of the controversy was entrusted during the early part of Elizabeth's reign, never ventured to urge the exclusive claim of episcopacy, or to connect the succession with the validity of the sacraments." But he asserts that "Saravia is a distinct and independent testimony to the doctrine of exclusive divine right of bishops." But Whitgift, who knew Saravia and his works, (as we have seen,) directly denies this; and Saravia's own language quoted is opposed to this view. Keble insinuates that Sutcliff and Bilson held this view. But we have seen that Whitgift defends Sutcliff from this charge, and that Bishop Stillingfleet refers to Bilson as opposed to the exclusive view. Bilson's work was published before Whitgift's letter was written, and we have Whitgift's positive statement that the defenders of episcopacy, previous to the date of that letter, 1594, had no intention to disparage or condemn any other form of church government.

Palmer concedes, *Treatise on Church*, ii, 388:—"Several of the schoolmen, held that a mere presbyter might confer every order except the episcopate, by commission from the church. Of this opinion have been several writers of the English church whose orthodoxy is unquestionable, amongst whom may be mentioned, Jewel, Hooker, and Field."

We have thus far traced the history of the unchurching theory. First asserted by the Romish church; introduced among Protestants at Geneva, from thence imported by the Eng-

lish Puritans, and from them borrowed and amplified by Archbishop Laud.

But the doctrine, like an exotic, did not thrive upon English soil. It never extended among the laity, but embraced by King Charles I. and some of the higher clergy, finally brought the unfortunate monarch and his bosom counselor to the scaffold. Says Hallam—"The king had deeply imbibed the tenets of Andrews and Laud, believing an episcopal government indispensable necessary to the valid administration of the sacraments." The history of Charles clearly shows that if he would have given up this notion he would have been restored to the throne. At the treaty of Uxbridge, the parliamentary commissioners offered to accede to Ussher's plan of a reduced episcopacy—but their offer was rejected by the king.

Bishop Montague, Laud's coadjutor, taught that—"Ordination by bishops is so necessary, that the church is no church without it, and the ministry is no true ministry, and ordinarily no salvation is to be obtained without it."

And what is the fruit of the introduction of this doctrine into England? We find that pictures, candlesticks and crucifixes are introduced into churches, communion tables are changed into conspicuous altars, there are frequent bowings in the course of the service, and much ceremony is used in the consecration of churches.*

* As an evidence of Laud's Popish tendencies, and to show where our modern innovators learned their lessons—we insert the account of the consecration of St. Catharine's church, as given by Rushworth, and quoted by Hume, vol. v, p. 68:—"On the bishop's approach to the west door of the church, a loud voice

Heylin, Laud's chaplain, writes : — " The doctrines are altered in many things, as for example, the pope is not regarded as Anti-christ, pictures, free will, etc.; the Thirty-Nine Articles seeming patient, if not ambitious of some Catholic meaning."

Says Sir Michael Foster, Ex. of Scheme of Church Power, p. 72 ;—" Certain enthusiastic conceits concerning the external beauties of religion, and the necessity of a general uniformity in the business of holy garments, holy seasons, significant gestures, church utensils and ornaments, seem to have been the ruling principles of these times."

" The king's ambassador, at Paris, has orders to withdraw himself from the communion of the Huguenots." Hume, vol. v, p. 70.

cried, ' Open, open, ye everlasting doors, that the king of glory may enter in ! ' Immediately the doors of the church flew open, and the bishop entered. Falling upon his knees with eyes elevated and arms expanded, he uttered these words—' This place is holy ; the ground is holy ; in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy ! '

" Going towards the chancel, he several times took up from the floor some of the dust and threw it into the air. When he approached, with his attendants, near to the communion table, he bowed frequently towards it ; and on their return they went round the church, repeating as they marched along, some of the Psalms ; and then said a form of prayer, which concluded with these words—' We consecrate this church, and separate it unto thee as holy ground, not to be profaned any more to common uses.'

" After this, the bishop, standing near the communion table, solemnly pronounced many imprecations upon such as should pollute that holy place by musters of soldiers, or keeping in it profane law courts, or carrying burdens through it. On the conclusion of every curse, he bowed towards the east, and cried—' let all the people say, amen.'

" The imprecations being all so piously finished, there were poured out a number of blessings upon such as had any hand in framing and building that sacred and beautiful edifice, or such as had given, or should hereafter give to it, any chalices, plate, or-

Bishop Montague holds conferences with Pazzani, the Jesuit, in reference to a union of the Anglican church with the Roman. Hallam, p. 272.' He thinks the doctrines can all be accommodated to the Romish, with this exception—that he is not altogether satisfied with regard to transubstantiation, but that a council of the church might arrange this matter satisfactorily.

The rebellion of an incensed people put a stop to the inroads of spiritual and political tyranny.

How little the innovations of Laud and his brother bishops had extended throughout his church, may be seen from several circumstances. While Charles was parleying with his adversaries, he inquired of three of his

naments, or utensils. At every benediction he in like manner bowed towards the east, and cried—'Let all the people say, amen.'

"The sermon followed. After which the bishop consecrated and administered communion in the following manner:—As he approached the communion table, he made many lowly reverences; and coming up to that part of the table where his bread and wine lay, he bowed seven times. After the reading of many prayers, he approached the sacramental elements, and gently lifted up the cover of the napkin in which the bread was placed. When he beheld the bread, he suddenly let fall the napkin, flew back a step or two, bowed three several times towards the bread; then he drew back again, opened the napkin and bowed as before. Next he laid his hands on the cup, which had a cover upon it, and was filled with wine. He let go the cup, fell back, and bowed thrice towards it. He approached again, and lifting up the cover peeped into the cup. Seeing the wine, he let fall the cover, returned back, and bowed as before. Then he received the sacrament and gave it to others. And many prayers being said, the solemnity of the consecration ended."

"Orders were given, and rigorously insisted on, that the communion table should be removed from the middle of the area, where it had hitherto stood in all churches, except in cathedrals. It was placed at the east end, railed in, and called an 'altar,' as the clergyman who officiated received commonly the name of 'priest.' The crucifix, too, was not forgotten on this occasion."

Yet this man is a saint and martyr with the advocates of the new divinity.

most devoted adherents, (Lords Jermyn, Culpepper and Ashburnham,) whether in conscience he could yield the point of episcopacy? They reply :—" If by conscience your meaning is, that you are obliged to do all that is in your power to support and sustain that function of bishops as that which is the most ancient, reverend and pious government of the church, we fully and heartily concur with you therein. But if by conscience is intended to assert, that episcopacy is *jure divino* exclusive, whereby no Protestant (or rather Christian) church can be acknowledged for such without a bishop, we must therein crave leave wholly to differ. And if we be in error we are in good company—*there not being*, (as we have cause to believe,) *six persons of the Protestant religion of the other opinion*. Thus much we can add, that, at the treaty of Uxbridge, none of your divines* there present, (though provoked thereunto,) would maintain that (we might say uncharitable) opinion ; no, not privately among your commissioners." Clarendon's State Papers, vol. xi, p. 202, 260, 274.

This proves to what a small party the doctrine of exclusive Divine right was confined, even in the days of Laud.

The Marquis of Hertford, one of the king's commissioners, argued—" The reverend doctors, on the king's part, affirm that episcopacy is of Divine right; the reverend ministers on the other side affirm that presbytery is of Divine right. For my part, I think neither one or the

* The divines on the king's part were Drs. Steward, Sheldon, Laney, Ferne, Potter, and Hammond.

other, nor any government whatever to be *jure divino*." On this, Bishop Warburton remarks : " Hertford seems to have read Hooker to more advantage than the king, his master, who fancied that great man contended for the *jus divinum* of episcopacy, in his ecclesiastical polity, in which he has been followed by many divines since." Neal's Puritans, vol. i, p. 530.

We thus see, by the testimony of this writer, (a dissenter,) that the claims of the Presbyterian divines of this time were fully as high as those of their Episcopalian brethren.

Sir Matthew Hale, the great and good chief justice of England, is a witness to the doctrine of pious, intelligent laymen of his time. While strongly attached to the church of England, to whose prayers, and preaching and sacraments he enjoined upon his family to adhere—his views were liberal and comprehensive ; after describing the true Christian, he says—"And he does all this, because he sees him who is invisible, and fears him because he loves him—fears him as well for his goodness as his greatness ; such a man, whether he be an Episcopalian, or a Presbyterian, or an Independent, or an Anabaptist, whether he wears a surplice, or whether he wears none, whether he hears organs or whether he hears none, whether he kneels at communion or for conscience sake stands or sits—he hath the life of religion, and that life acts on him, and will conform his soul to the image of his Saviour, and walk along with him to eternity, notwithstanding his practice or non-practice of these indifferents." He was angry

especially at those who would so manage their differences about such things, as to show that they had a greater zeal for their own additions than for the common saving truths and duties which all agreed on, and that did so manage their several little and selfish causes, as annulled or injured the common cause of the Christian and Reformed churches. He considered "that particular churches or conventions of Christians might differ in government ordinations and ceremonies, without breaking the unity of the visible church, so long as they heed the fundamentals of faith, and Christ's institutions, in common with other churches; that no determinate form is of Divine institution; the primitive practice, since the apostles' times, seems to have been episcopal; but that the essence of the Christian religion did not consist in this or any other form of church government." Hone's Life, p. 298.

After the restoration, several attempts were made at a comprehension of dissenters by the house of bishops, but always failed through the intolerance of the lower house of convocation. After the accession of William III, the unchurching theory received a fresh impulse, from the ultra views of the non-jurors, who favored the claims of James II, a Romanist. In this reign, the two sections of the church took the names of high and low church. Says Hallam, p. 623—"About the end of William's reign, grew up the distinction of high and low churchmen—the first distinguished by great pretensions to sacerdotal powers both spiritual and temporal, by a repugnance to

toleration, and by a firm adherence to tory principles; the latter by the opposite characteristics."

With the spread of high church influences, came in, as before, the doctrines and practices of Popery.

Writes Bishop Burnet, in Queen Anne's reign, one hundred and thirty years since—"There appeared, at this time, an inclination in many of the clergy to a nearer approach to the church of Rome. Hicks, an ill-tempered man, who was now at the head of the Jacobite party, had, in several works, promoted a notion, that there was a proper sacrifice made in the eucharist, and had, on many occasions, studied to lessen an aversion to Popery; the supremacy of this arm in ecclesiastical matters; and the method in which the reformation was carried was openly condemned. One Brett had preached a sermon in several of the pulpits in London, which he afterwards printed, in which he pressed the necessity of priestly absolution, in a strain beyond what was pretended to even in the church of Rome; he said no repentance could save without it, and affirmed that the priest was vested with the same power of pardoning that our Saviour himself had. Dodwell thought that none could be saved but those who by the sacraments had a federal right to it, and that these were the seals of the covenant; so that he left all who died without the sacraments to the uncovenanted mercies of God; and to this he added, that none had a right to give the sacraments, but those who were commissioned to it; and these

were the apostles, and after them bishops and priests ordained by them ; it followed by this that sacraments by others were of no value. He pursued these notions so far, that he asserted that the souls of men were naturally mortal, but that the immortalizing virtue was conveyed in baptism, given by those episcopally ordained. This strange and precarious system was in great credit among us ; and the necessity of the sacrament and the invalidity of ecclesiastical functions, when performed by persons not episcopally ordained, were entertained by many with great applause : this made the dissenters pass for no Christians, and put all thoughts of reconciling them to us far out of view, and several little books were spread about the nation, to prove the necessity of re-baptizing them, and that they were in a state of damnation till this was done." (Vol. vi, p. 123-4-5.)

In his introduction to his third volume of History of Reformation, he writes—" But what can be said of men who are already going into some of the worse parts of Popery ? It is well known that in practice, the necessity of auricular confession and the priestly absolution, with the conceit of the sacrifice of the mass, are the most gainful parts of Popery, and are indeed those that most effectually subdue the world unto it. The indispensable necessity of the priesthood to all sacred functions is carried, in the point of baptism, further than Popery ; their doctrines are openly recommended, and a union with the Anglican church impudently proposed ; the reformation and the

Reformers are, by many, daily vilified. . . . Besides a vast number of little superstitious practices, that in some places have gone to a great height, so that we are insensibly going off from the reformation, and framing a new model of a church totally different from all our former principles, as well as from our present establishment; to all which they have added that singular and extravagant conceit of the invalidity of baptism, unless administered by one episcopally ordained."

Who can help remarking the similarity of Burnet's times to our own?

After this period, a dark cloud appeared to hang over the English church; her spiritual life, appeared waning. And when she was roused from her lethargy, at the close of the last century, who were the instruments, under God, of the revival? It was that company of devoted ministers—Romaine, and Venn, and Milner, and Newton, and Scott, and Cecil, and Simeon; assisted by those eminent Christian laymen—Thornton, Wilberforce, and Zachary Macauley—men of moderate, mild and catholic sentiments.

We have seen, in our own time, the attempt to revive the views of Laud and Montague, Hickes, Brett, and Dodwell. And what has been the result? Popery has again followed in their train, and Protestant Christendom has been saddened by the sight of clergymen and laymen, in this era of light and knowledge, leaving pure branches of the Church Catholic, for the corrupt, unscriptural, and idolatrous worship of the Romish system.

Let us now review our position, and examine its strength. We have seen that the American Episcopal Church is moderate, comprehensive, and charitable in her views. That the church of England is of the same character, has been established by showing—

1. That the compilers of the Articles intended that they should comprehend Christians of all persuasions.

2. That public acts were passed recognizing the church character of non-episcopal communions.

3. That ministers not episcopally ordained held livings in the church of England for more than one hundred years after the reformation.

4. That the ordinal can not be exclusive in its meaning, as such was not the view of its framers.

5. That all the eminent archbishops of Canterbury, with but two exceptions, were of the same opinion—as were also the great body of the standard divines of the church of England.

And, lastly, that the history of the exclusive theory proves it to be of foreign importation, a novelty of an insidious and dangerous nature.

In view of these facts, what, my brethren, is our duty?—shall we countenance and encourage such errors?

I answer, no—our course is plain—we should oppose and resist them with all the energy that God has given us—but in a Christian, a temperate and honorable manner. “The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual.”

It is our duty to oppose them—because the history of the system shows it to be dangerous

and destructive. The two saddest periods in the history of the church of England have been those of Laud, and that succeeding the restoration—times when great efforts were made to propagate the exclusive doctrine.

While the golden eras of that church—the reformation, and fifty years succeeding—and the revival of the last century, are marked by the growth of opposite views. And the history of our own times has warned us loudly of its sad consequences, and of our duty, to be watchful, and energetic in opposing it.

How false, then, the charge brought against the *moderate. liberal* portion of our communion—that they are *no churchmen*.

As well might the foreigner with his mind filled with European monarchical sentiments, charge with disaffection the true sons of America, and assert that *his* principles are the fair exponents of the American constitution. The one charge is no more unfounded or extravagant than the other.

No, my brethren, the exclusive theory is a fungus, an unhealthy excrescence, disfiguring the noble tree of catholicity. It may be likened to the parasite which twines itself around the trunk, and is said finally to destroy that, which at a distance, it seems to adorn. Nor can we regard these comparisons as unjust, when we read the history of this error, and consider how injurious it has been to the peace, the growth, and the good name of our beloved Zion.

It is unjust, it is absurd, to charge men with a want of churchmanship, in the cant terms of

radicalism, puritanism, etc., because they will not receive *an exploded Genevan notion*—a doctrine our Presbyterian brethren have tried and rejected, as unprofitable and vain—because they prefer to hold with Cranmer and the reformers; Whitgift and his illustrious contemporaries; Bishop White and our American fathers, and with the great body of eminent English divines; rather than with Laud, Montague, and their colleagues—Dodwell, Hicks, and the Non-jurors; Dr. Pusey, the Bishop of Exeter, and Archdeacon Wilberforce.

If the intelligent laity of our church will carefully study her standards, and interpret them according to those fair and just rules by which they are accustomed to construe the political constitution of our country, many of them will find that they have been misled in this matter; and that our church, instead of teaching, (as some positively affirm she does,) the exclusive theory, does at most but TOLERATE it as a mere private opinion.

We earnestly desire the extension of our free, comprehensive, conservative, apostolic church. This theory we are opposing is doing more than all other causes, except our own worldliness, to hinder this extension. We may apply with truth to our own times the language of Bishop Burnet. He writes, (*History of his Times*, volume vi, page 184,)—“I see a spirit rising among us, too like that of the church of Rome, of advancing the clergy beyond their due authority, to an unjust pitch; this rather heightens jealousies and prejudices against us than advances our real authority. To speak plainly, these extravagant notions, which have been too much drunk in

by the clergy of my time, have weakened the power of the church, and soured men's minds against it, more than all the books wrote or attempts made against it could have done; and indeed the secret poison of these principles has given too many of the clergy a bias towards Popery, with an aversion to the reformation, which has brought them under much contempt." P: 210:—"They ought to understand Popery well, to view it in its politics as well as in its religious corruptions, that they may observe and guard against their secretest practices; particularly that main one, that prevails so fatally among us, of *making us despise the foreign churches, and hate the dissenters at home.*"

Had the author been gifted with the spirit of prophecy, he could not have depicted more accurately the present state of things in our church. We are happy to close our argument with the words of a writer so temperate and wise.

In conclusion, allow the writer to say—that he entertains no personal hostilities; but he has felt bound to expose a system from the injurious effects of which he has suffered, but from the influence of which he trusts he is now free. He has spoken plainly, because he feels deeply, and the times demand plainness of speech. He knows from his own experience, and from extensive observation, how fascinating and ensnaring is the system he is opposing; its tendency to blind the mind and enslave the judgment. He has discharged what he believed to be a solemn duty, trusting all consequences to Him who "searcheth the heart, and worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

INDEX
OF
AUTHORITIES REFERRED TO
IN THE
FOREGOING WORK.

ALLEY, Bp.,	51
Andrews, Bp.,	68, 69
Articles 19 and 23d,	27
Ashburnham, Lord,	101
Angustine, St.,	37
Aylmer, Bp.,	64
BABINGTON, Bp.,	69
Bacon, Lord,	95
Bancroft, Abp.,	41, 67, 86, 94
Bellarmino,	43, 95
Beza,	37, 50, 85
Bilson, Bp.,	51, 67, 94, 97
Bingham,	68, 81
Bramball, Abp.,	52, 80
Brett, Dr.,	104
Bridges, Bp.,	38, 67, 94
Bradford, John,	64
Brownell, Bp.,	7
Bucer,	64
Bullinger,	64
Burnet, Bp.,	28, 31, 65, 69, 80, 104, 107
CANON, 55th, Church of England,	30

Cosin, Bp.,	31, 33, 79
Cavellerius,	32
Corranus,	32
Cartwright,	37, 43, 96
Cosins, Dr.,	38
Cooper, Bp.,	39, 52, 94, 97
Calvin,	50, 72
Crackenthorpe, Dr.,	55
Chillingworth,	62
Cox, Bp.,	64, 65
Craumer, Abp.,	11, 65
Claggett, Dr.,	74
Courayer, Dr.,	76
Comber, Dean,	81
Charles I,	98, 100
Culpepper, Lord,	101
Clarendon State Papers,	101
Doctr, Synod of,	30
De Laune, Dr.,	33
Downham, Bp.,	54
Dodwell, Dr.,	104
ELIZABETH, Act of 13th of,	29
FULLER, Thomas Dr.,	37, 59
Fulke, Dr.,	41, 54
Field, Dr.,	48, 52, 67, 80, 97
Forbes, Bp.,	61
Falkland, Lord,	102
Foster, Sir Michael,	99
Ferne, Dr.,	101
GRINDALL, Abp.,	35, 66
Gregory Nazianzen,	56
HALLAM,	33, 39, 94, 95, 96, 98, 103
Hooker, Richard,	35, 50, 80, 94, 97, 102
Hall, Bp.,	33, 39, 43, 56
Heylin, Dr.,	45, 99
Hales, Dr.,	61

Hooper, Bp.,	64, 65
Hone's, Rev. R. B., Lives,	35, 66, 74, 103
Horneck, Dr.,	74
Heber, Bp.,	83
Holland, Dr.,	95
Hertford, Marquis of,	101
Hume,	99
Hammond, Dr.,	102
Hickes, Dr.	104
Hale, Sir Matthew,	103
JEWELL, Bp.,	35, 40, 46, 80, 94, 97
Jerome, St.,	44, 46
Jackson, Dr. Thomas,	58
James I,	95
Jermyn, Lord,	102
KEBLE,	30, 97
Knollys, Sir Francis,	39
Low, Dr.,	39
Luther,	44, 72
Laud, Abp.,	77, 94, 96, 98
Leighton, Abp.,	80
Laney, Dr.,	101
MORRISON, Rev. John,	32, 35
Macauley,	33
Medina Michael,	40
Mason, Archdeacon,	49, 80
Morton, Bp.,	56
Mosheim, Maclaine's,	76
Montagne, Bp.,	98, 100
NOWELL, Dean,	51
Neyle, Bp.,	51
Neal's Puritans,	102
OVERALL, Bp.,	33, 49, 67
Ordinal and Preface,	63
PREFACE to the American Prayer Book,	10
Pastoral Letters,	23, 25, 26

Parker, Abp.,	34, 35, 66
Philpot, Archdeacon,	64
Pilkington, Bp.,	32, 66
Perkins, Dr. Wm.,	47
Palmer, Dr. Wm.,	48, 97
Parr, Dr.,	61
Pearson, Bp.,	61, 73
Potter, Abp.,	77
Parkinson, Rev. Ed.,	80
Prynne,	95
Potter, Dr.,	101
Pazzani,	100
RANDOLPH, Dr.,	35
Reynolds, Dr. John,	39, 52, 61
Rhemish Testament,	41
Redmayn, Dr.,	65
Robertson, Dr.,	65
Ridley, Bp.,	11, 66
Rushworth,	99
SMITH, Dr. Wm.,	12, 15
Seabury, Bp.,	21
Strype,	29, 85
Saravia, Dr.,	38, 87, 90, 92, 94, 98
Sutcliffe, Dr.,	38, 87, 90, 92, 94, 98
Stillingfleet, Bp.,	51, 62, 98
Sewell, Prof.,	58
Sandys, Abp.,	66
Sanderson, Bp.,	70, 71
Sherlock, Dean,	74
Scott, Dr. John,	75
Sancroft, Abp.,	75
Secker, Abp.,	77
Sharp, Abp.,	78
Sumner, Abp.,	77
Smith, Rev. Mr.,	83
St. Catharine's Church, Con. of,	99

Sheldon, Dr.,	101
Steward, Dr.,	101
TOMLINE, Bp.,	28
Tillotson, Abp.,	76
USSHER, Abp.,	60, 98
Uniformity, Act of,	69, 78
Uxbridge, Treaty of,	98, 101
WHARTON, Dr. Chas. H.,	15, 18
White, Bp.,	18, 21, 27, 84
Whittingham, Wm.,	32
Whittingham, Bp.,	11, 34, 35
Wake, Abp.,	21, 76
Wilson, Dr. Bird,	18
Whitgift, Abp.,	37, 38, 46, 67, 85, 94, 97
Whittaker, Dr. Wm.,	43, 52
Wood, Anthony,	43, 52
Willet, Dr. Andrew,	46
White, Dr. Thomas,	55
White, Bp. Francis,	55
William III, Bishops' Address to,	72
Warburton, Bp.,	102
ZURICH, Letters,	64